Imprimatur,

Sam. Parker R. in Chriſto Patri ac D^no^. D^no^. *Gilberto, Arch. Epiſc. Cantuar. à ſac.* Dom.

April 15.
1673.

Imprimatur,

Sam. Parker R. in Chriſto Patri ac D^no^. D^no^. *Gilberto, Arch. Epiſc. Cantuar. à ſac.* Dom.

April 15.
1673.

AN ANSWER

To several late

TREATISES,

Occasioned by a Book entituled a

DISCOURSE

Concerning the

IDOLATRY

Practised in the

CHURCH of ROME,

AND

The Hazard of Salvation in the Communion of it.

By *Edward Stillingfleet* D. D. Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majesty.

The First Part.

LONDON,
Printed by *R. W.* for *Henry Mortlock*, and are to be sold at his Shop, at the Sign of the *Phœnix* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. 1673.

THE

General Preface.

IT is not for any pleaſure I take in Controverſie, nor out of a Reſolution to maintain what I have once written, that I expoſe my ſelf again to the Cenſures of Some, and the Rage of others, in Defence of our Church againſt the Church of Rome: But out of a juſt ſenſe of the Weight and goodneſs of the Cauſe I have undertaken; which (if my affection to it hath not ſtrangely blinded my judgement) doth highly concern us as Men, as Engliſh Men, and as Chriſtians. For it is the Cauſe of Senſe and Reaſon, againſt the

the absurd Doctrines they impose on both; it is the Cause of our Nation against the Usurpation and Tyranny of a Forrain Power; it is the Cause of the true Faith and Christianity, against the Errors and Corruptions of the Roman Church. To abandon such a Cause as this, were to betray the things which ought to be most dear to us: for we cannot be reconciled to that Church on any easier terms, than renouncing our Sense and Reason, enslaving our Country, and hazarding our Salvation. And what can they give us in exchange for these?

It was the last of those three Heads, which gave occasion to the late so much railed at, and so little confuted Book: which no sooner appeared, but as if some dreadful Monster had risen out of the earth, some crossed themselves and kept as far out of the sight of it, as they could; others made hideous out-crys and grievous complaints; and the more fearful sort were forbidden either looking on it, or entertaining any dis-

diſcourſe about it. Upon which I pleaſed my ſelf that I had not added another Chapter to the Book; for if that number had agreed with the ten particulars, it had paſſed among them for the Beaſt with ſeven Heads and ten Horns; *and they would have been glad their* City upon ſeven Hills *could have been ſo excuſed. But this unuſual noiſe and clamour awakened the curioſity of many who love to ſee ſtrange ſights; and that which otherwiſe might have been wholly neglected as a Book, was enquired after and looked into, being repreſented as a Monſter.*

But when they found that this evil Spirit (as they accounted it) which themſelves had raiſed, was not to be laid again by hard words and ill language; they began to conſider what other courſe was to be taken to ſuppreſs it. And forthwith there ſtarts up a Young Sophiſter among them, and bids them be of good heart; for by letting flie at him ſome Squibs and Crackers he did not queſtion, but he ſhould

ſhould put this Monſter into ſuch a Rage, *as to make him fall upon himſelf; which deſign being highly approved; in a ſhort time came forth that dapper piece, called* Doct. Stillingfleet againſt Doct. Stillingfleet. *It was a notable plot, and cunningly managed, as the* Reader *may ſee by the following Anſwer to it. After him a Graver Perſon undertakes the ſervice; but as* Haſenmullerus *tells us, when* Ignatius Loyola *ſent one of his Brethren at* Rome *to diſpoſſeſs a Perſon, he gave him this inſtruction, that* he ſhould be ſure to come behind the Devil, if he would drive him out; *accordingly this* N. O. *ſteals quite behind my Book, and began to confute it at the wrong end, hoping by that means to drive out the evil Spirit which he ſuppoſed to lodge in the Body of it. Which he hath performed with great dexterity and ſucceſs, as the* Reader *may be fully ſatisfied in the Reply here following. Theſe two I undertook, before any other appear-*

Haſenmull. hiſt Jeſuit. ordin. c. 8.

ed

ed, and intended to have publiſhed theſe two Anſwers by themſelves; but finding others that had written againſt me on the ſame argument I was willing to bring as much as I could together to prevent confuſion or repetition. All which relating to the Principles of Faith, and the Reſolution, and Rule of it, I made account to have diſpatched at once; but finding the Book begin to ſwell into too great a bulk, I have reſpited ſome parts of it to another opportunity.

When thoſe two men had done their Feats, an ancient and experienced Exorciſt; (and yet for all that no Conjurer) ſaw plainly this Spirit muſt be conjured down; and thefore knowing the great efficacy of Charms, he gives his Book the Title of ΤΩ ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΩ Stillingfleeton. *Which words put me almoſt in as great a fright as the* Holy Chair *would have done; I began to conſider, whether* Mengus *or any other of their skilful men had ever uſed thoſe Emphatical words be-*

fore; but I am willing to believe it was the ſole invention of J. V. C. *And I doubt not but they will do well hereafter in* Exorciſms, *eſpecially after the* holy Potion, *when the perſon to be diſpoſſeſſed is made ſufficiently ſick with* Rue *and* Sallet-oyl *and other excellent Phyſick for Devils. I find by ſome of their Authors, it is a great matter to get the right name of the Spirit; this* J. V. C. *hath hit unluckily, in calling this Monſter* the Leviathan ſporting in the waters, *ſince they have thrown out ſo many empty veſſels for him to play with. And his three books of Charms, have been no unpleaſant entertainment; But he is gone; and I love not to tread hard on the graves of my enemies. What there appears material in him (if any thing do ſo) I ſhall conſider it in its proper place; chiefly for the ſake of my Judicious Adverſary Dr.* T. G. *who was the firſt and I think the only perſon that hath diſcovered his Book to be a* Learned Treatiſe.

But my generous Adverſaries, finding ſo little ſucceſs in ſingle attempts, they next fall upon me with Chain-ſhot; viz. A Collection of ſeveral Treatiſes againſt Doct. Stillingfleet. *To make up the number, they bring in one before publiſhed, to try an experiment what force that can have in conjunction which had none of it ſelf.*

The firſt undertaker therein, is, the very calm and (according to his new Chriſtian Name) Serene *Mr. Creſſy, the man that hath learnt to mortifie paſſions by Myſtical Divinity; but is ſo far from being ſublimed and rectified, by that Chymical way of devotion, that he ſeems yet to remain in the very dregs of them: the man, that hath ſo accuſtomed himſelf to Legends, that he cannot write againſt an Adverſary, without making one of him. And although there be many very pleaſant ones in his Church-Hiſtory, yet I hardly think there are many more wonderful, than (if his inſinua-*

tions had any colour of truth in them) *the first part of my life had been. For by making me so active in those times, when I was uncapable of understanding what they were, he seems to represent me as one that had so passionate a zeal for Presbytery in my cradle, that I would suck of none but a Scottish Nurse; that the first word I pronounced was Covenant; that I would go to School to none but Lay-Elders; and was cursing* Meroz *before the Parliament at eight years old. Is not this a hopeful beginning for a good Legend?* Will *he, saith he,* or they damn the execrable Covenant? *as though, I had ever any thing to do with it but when I renounced it! If I should tell him, that as great a Friend as he takes me to have been to Presbytery and the late times, even then I was entred into Episcopal Orders by a most worthy and learned Prelate of our Church; that, I never subscribed any Address to the Usurpers, as some in the World have done,*

S. C. p. 79.

done, and those who would now be thought the Kings most loyal Subjects; that I never drew off any one person from their Allegiance to the King to submit to to the Popes Nuncio, (let those who did it clear themselves) even such an Apology would give too much countenance to so pitiful a Calumniator. I thank him that he hath not charged me with laying the first platform of Presbytery at Geneva, or having a hand in the first and second Admonitions in the days of Queen Elizabeth; and I might as will charge him with the Gunpowder Treason, as he doth me with any thing about the Covenant. By this we may guess what Ecclesiastical History we are to expect from him, who writes so at random about the matters of our own times. But the man is to be pitied; he was under one of Mother Juliana's fits, he writ with a good mind, but he knew not what. Some vent must be given to a violent fermentation, else the vessel might burst asunder; and I hope the good man is some-

ſomewhat more at eaſe, ſince he purged away ſo much Choler. I aſſure him I can with pleaſure read what he wrote with rage; and laugh at the violence of ſuch paſſions, which like a Gun ill charged may give fire and make a great noiſe, but doth the greateſt miſchief to him that holds it. If I would purſue him through all his heats, I muſt undergo the Ordeal-tryal, *touch firebrands without hurting my ſelf: which although I might do, yet I know my Adverſaries are ſo implacable, that even that would not convince them of my innocence. I leave him therefore to grow cooler and wiſer; but I beſeech him for his own ſake, that he would attempt no more the juſtifying* the union of no-
S. C. p. 46. thing with nothing, *and for the ſake of Religion, that he would not call* God *any more* an incomprehenſible Nothing; *a Deſcription fit only for the Atheiſts Catechiſm. If there were any thing in his railing Book which looked like reaſon or argument I might perhaps at my leiſure.*

leiſure be perſwaded to anſwer it; though I do not love to have to do with mad men, no not in their lucid intervals.

The next that follows is one that goes about to vindicate the Roman Churches devotions and Doctrine of Repentance and Indulgencies, *he is a meer pattern of meekneſs, compared with* S. C., *he writes pertinently and without the others bitterneſs and paſſion. His great endeavour is to clear the honour of his Church, from the abſurd Doctrines and practices charged upon it. And the force of all, he ſaith lies in this*, that where the Church hath defined nothing in her Councils, it is to no purpoſe to object that ſuch Doctrines are taught by ſome in it; for thoſe who defend their ſeparation from the Communion of a Church by reaſon of its erroneous or corrupt Doctrines muſt make it appear that thoſe are taught by it, and the belief of them alſo exacted from its ſubjects. *To this*

Roman Doctrine of Repentance, &c. vindicated *p.* 19.

this purpoſe S. C. *likewiſe ſpeaks* (*in ſome of his lucid intervalls*) *and I perceive this is become a common Topick among them, to take off the* odium *of ſuch opinions and practices as they are willing enough, but aſhamed to defend, which I ſhall in this place briefly remove. The thing I was to prove was, that perſons in the Communion of the Roman Church do run great hazard of their Salvation: for which I inſtanced particularly in ſeveral opinions and practices which are very apt to hinder a good life which is neceſſary to Salvation. Now a twofold Queſtion here ariſes.* 1. *Whether the Church may juſtly be charged with thoſe Doctrines and practices?* 2. *Whether, although the Church may not directly be charged to have decreed them in her Councils, yet ſo much countenance and encouragement be not commonly given to them in that Church, that particular perſons do run great hazard of their ſalvation by reaſon of them? For which we are to conſider,*

der, that it hath been the method of the Roman Church to allow many more things in common belief and practice than it hath dared for very ſhame to decree in Councils, eſpecially when ſuch things have been objected by her enemies. In this caſe it hath been thought the moſt prudent courſe for the Councils to ſpeak deceitfully and in general terms, ſo as to give as little advantage as may be to their enemies, and yet to retain ground enough to uphold their former opinions and practices: Which ſtill continuing in Vogue and reputation, become ſo much the more dangerous to mens Souls, becauſe their Councils having had opportunity to have declared effectually againſt them were ſo far from it, that by their doubtful expreſſions they have left ground enough for the continuance of them. Now from hence the Directors of Conſcience among them frame their opinions, and the people think it their duty blindly to follow them; and ſuppoſing any one among them ſhould ſcruple any

ſuch Doctrine or practice, to whom muſt he reſort but to his Confeſſors, and will any ſuch dare to condemn what is generally received although not decreed by Councils? or if he ſhould, dare any perſon rely on his private judgement when it is contrary to the moſt received Doctrine or practice? Beſides, the promiſes of Infallibility are ſuppoſed by them to be primarily made to the Church, and only by way of repreſentation to the Council; and therefore Doctrines or practices generally received and allowed by the Teachers of the Church and the Guides of conſcience, muſt be received by them as true and good; for otherwiſe thoſe promiſes would fail to the Church in its diffuſive capacity, and conſequently, ſuppoſing no General Council, it were poſſible for the moſt erroneous and pernicious Doctrines and practices to prevail in the Church, which muſt utterly overthrow all pretence to Infallibility. But in our preſent caſe we need not run ſo far, for I ſhall here prove that in the moſt material points inſiſted

fisted on by N. O. *viz.* the Doctrine of the efficacy of the Sacraments *ex opere Operato*, and of Indulgences, *we do justly charge the Church of* Rome *even in the decrees of her Councils with laying such a foundation, as doth overthrow the necessity of a good life. The way he takes to vindicate those points from this consequence is this, That the* Sacramenta mortuorum, *viz.* Baptism and Penance which confer justifying Grace do require a subject rightly disposed; *And the* Sacramenta vivorum, *viz.* Confirmation, Eucharist and Extreme unction, do require the receiver to be actually in a State of Grace; *the same, he saith of* Indulgences, that the benefit of them doth suppose a man put into a State of Grace by the Sacrament of Penance; *so that the whole matter is put upon this issue, whether their Doctrine concerning the conditions by which a man*

P. 44.

P. 47.

P. 79.

may be put into a State of Grace, be not ſuch as doth overthrow the neceſſity of a good life? And it being acknowledged that the Sacrament of Penance doth confer the Grace of juſtification on all perſons rightly diſpoſed for it, our only buſineſs is to enquire what neceſſary conditions their Church requires in order to it. For which we appeal to the words of the Council *of* Trent, *for* Seſſion 14. *c.* 4. *That plainly determins, that* imperfect contrition or attrition although it cannot bring men to juſtification without the Sacrament of Penance, yet it doth diſpoſe men for obtaining the Grace of God by the Sacrament of Penance. *If we joyn this now with another decree of the ſame Council, viz.* * that the Sacraments do conferr

Et quamvis ſint Sacramento Pœnitentiæ per ſe ad juſtificationem perducere peccatorem nequeat (attritio); tamen eum ad Dei gratiam in Sacramento Pœnitentiæ impetrandam diſponit. Concil. Trident. ſeſſ. 14. *c.* 4.

* *Si quis dixerit Sacramenta novæ Legis non continere Gratiam quam ſignificant, aut gratiam ipſam non ponentibus obicem non conferre---- Anathema ſit. Seſſ.* 7. *Can.* 6.

Si quis dixerit non dari gratiam per hujus modi Sacramenta ſemper & omnibus, quantum eſt ex parte Dei, etiamſi ritè ea ſuſcipiant, ſed aliquando & aliquibus, Anathema ſit. Can. 7.

Grace

Grace on all thoſe who are diſpoſed to receive it; *I leave it now to any one to judge, whether from hence it doth not neceſſarily follow, that all thoſe that have but imperfect contrition, or bare attrition for their ſins, are by the Sacrament of Penance put into a State of Grace, according to the Doctrine of the* Council *of* Trent? *And how far this overthrows the neceſsity of a good life, will appear from the explication of* contrition *and* attrition *given by the ſame Council.* Contrition *is defined, to be,* a grief of mind and deteſtation of ſin committed, with a purpoſe of ſinning no more; *therefore* imperfect contrition *or* attrition *muſt be ſuch a grief and deteſtation of ſin paſt, as implies but an imperfect purpoſe of ſinning no more. From which it evidently follows, that by the Doctrine of this Council a man may be put into a State of Grace without ſo much as a firm or perfect purpoſe of ſinning no more. And can there* Seſſ. 14. c. 4.

there be a Doctrine invented by men that doth more effectually destroy the necessity of a good life than this doth? For the State of Grace puts a man actually into the favour of God; and supposing him to fall into mortal sin afterwards, all he needs to do, is only to repeat the same kind of attrition and receive the Sacrament of Penance and he is perfectly sound again and recovers the Favour of God. I know the Council there saith, That this attrition must exclude voluntatem peccandi, *as* O. N. *observes; but that implies no more than a mans not having at that time a purpose to sin again; and the Council distinguishes it from the* propositum non peccandi de cætero, *or the purpose not to sin again, which the Council applies to* contrition *as the other to* attrition. *And* Cajetan *himself quoted by*
P. 45. O. N. *calls it* an imperfect purpose of not sinning. *So that after all the evasions which have been yet, or can be produced, the Roman Churches Doctrine*

of

of Repentance *and* Indulgences *doth most dangerously obstruct devotion and a good life. I desire therefore* O. N. *and his Brethren to be a little more sparing in their censures of us as unfaithfully representing the Doctrine of their Church, for we understand it much better, and represent it more truly, than they desire.*

But supposing the words of the Council were ambiguous in this matter, what better help can we have to understand it, than the sense of their most eminent and learned Instructours of Conscience? and those not of the single Order of Jesuits, *as some would have it believed, but of all sorts among them.* Melchior Canus *who was far enough from being a Friend of the* Jesuits, *saith expresly*, although a man knows he hath not contrition but bare attrition, he may come to the Sacrament and receive grace by it; *for which he gives this reason*, becaus̃e Baptism and Penance, are

Melch. Cano Relect. de Pœnit. part. 6. p. 932.

Sa-

Sacramenta mortuorum; and therefore thoſe who are under mortal ſin if they have attrition whereby the impediment is removed may not only come to them, but go away with the Grace conferred, becauſe the Sacraments always conferr Grace, where the impediment is removed.

Morinus de Pœnit. Sacramento l. 8. c. 4. n. 27.

And he is followed herein, ſaith Morinus, *not only by* Lopez, Peſantius, Nicol. Iſambertus *Profeſſor of Divinity at* Paris, *but by the far greateſt number of their modern Divines. I ſhall not*

La Morale de Jeſuits l. v. 2. ch. 2. ſ. 253.

ſo much as mention the Jeſuitical Caſuiſts *whoſe Teſtimonies are produced in the* Jeſuits Morals, *or* Provincial letters, *ſuch as* Filliutius, Amicus, Sa, Eſcobar, Bauny, *&c. But I ſhall name ſome of far greater Authority among them.* O. N. *frequently cites* Paul

Layman. Theol. Moral. l. 5. tract. 6. c. 2. ſect. 2.

Layman *with expreſſions of eſteem, and he determins that* true contrition is not neceſſary to the Sacrament of Penance after the commiſſion of mortal

mortal ſin, but attrition is ſufficient although a man know it to be only attrition. *If they had made attrition only neceſſary to the Sacrament of Baptiſm, they might have pleaded, that they had not deſtroyed the neceſſity of a good life afterwards to preſerve the Grace conveyed in Baptiſm; but we ſee in the caſe of mortal ſin afterwards* toties quoties *no more is neceſſary but a new Act of* Attrition, *and that not only when a man miſtakes it to be* contrition; *but though a man knows it to be bare* attrition. *I confeſs* Cardinal Tolet, *although he aſſerts the ſubſtance of the Doctrine, yet he ſaith* attrition only ſerves when it is miſtaken for contrition; *but this* Morinus *tells us the later Divines laugh at and explode.* Cardinal Lugo *not only contends for the Doctrine, but aſſerts it to be the Doctrine of the* Council *of* Trent, *viz.* that attrition with the Sacrament of Penance is ſufficient for the Grace of Juſtification; *and*

Tolet. Summ Caſ. l. 3. c 4.

Morinus de Pœnit. l. 8. c. 4 n. 1.

Lugo de Pœnit. diſp. 5. ſect. 9. n. 130 135.

quotes Suarez, Vaſquez *and* Mæratius, *as ſufficiently proving from the words of the* Council, that attrition is the next diſpoſition to the Grace of juſtification conveyed by the Sacrament; *and this* attrition *he there ſhews againſt* Sylvius, *doth not imply* an imperfect love of God above all; *which is directly contrary to* O. N. *And in another place he proves*, that a man is not bound always to contrition for his ſins although they be mortal; *for ſaith he*, if he were, then a man having attrition cannot be excuſed but only by invincible Ignorance from a new mortal ſin in coming to the Sacrament of Penance without contrition, becauſe ſome time is commonly ſuppoſed to intervene between a mans attrition and his juſtification by the Sacrament, in which time he would ſin mortally by omitting contrition, if he were obliged to it; but this,

O. N. p. 45.

Lugo diſp. 7. ſect. 11. n. 201.

ſaith

ſaith he, is againſt the common opinion of Divines, that a man contracts any new guilt by omitting contrition. *Nay he afterwards determins*, that a man that hath received the Sacrament of Penance with bare attrition is not bound, under the guilt of mortal ſin, for omitting it, to an act of contrition at the point of death; which is, *he ſaith*, the commonly received opinion among them, and he quotes Diana, Coninch, Becanus, Layman, Fagundez, Faber, Turrianus, Salas *and others for it. The great argument he brings, is*, becauſe Confeſſors do not think themſelves obliged to put men in mind of an act of contrition at that time as neceſſary, as common experience ſhews. *And are not ſuch Confeſſors excellent Guides to Heaven the mean while? If they be, they have found out a much broader way and wider gate than ever Chriſt intended. What not* Sect. 13. n. 263.

one ſingle act of contrition neceſſary! No, not at the point of death! What pity it is for ſinners, you have not the keeping of Heaven-gates? How do they want the Sacrament of Penance in Hell, for no doubt there is attrition *good ſtore there! But above all of them commend me to honeſt* Gregor. de Valentiâ, *who not only makes contrition unneceſſary, but ſaith* it is rather a hindrance to the effect of the Sacraments. *From whence* Morinus *juſtly infers*, that a Confeſſor ought not to perſwade the Penitent to Contrition; nor the penitent to endeavour after it. *Nay* Morinus *ſhews*, that grave men and famous in their Church do aſſert that a Penitent having received the Sacrament of Penance, is not bound to ſo much as one act of contrition or the Love of God in order to his reconciliation with God. *Yea*, although a man hath hated God to the laſt act of his life if

Grez. de Valent. Tom. 4. diſp. 7. q. 8. punct. 4. ſect. Secundo poteſt.

Morin. de pœnit. l. 8. c. 4. n. 15.

Id. ib. n. 26.

if he receives the Sacrament of Penance, they deny that it is neceſſary for him to be contrite for his ſins or to love God. *Nothing could go beyond this but what follows in him*, that the excellency of the Evangelical Sacraments above the legal conſiſts in this, that the Evangelical Sacraments have freed us from the moſt heavy yoke of contrition and the Love of God. *O admirable Guides of Conſcience! I do not at all queſtion but* Jews, Turks *and* Heathens *have a much better and truer notion of* Repentance, *than theſe men*; *the* Pagan Philoſophers *were* Chriſtians *to them. And what injury have I done them now, in charging ſuch things upon them which obſtruct devotion and overthrow the neceſſity of a good life? For I hardly think it poſſible to contrive a Doctrine more effectual for that end, than to*

Sacramentorum Evangelicorum ſupra legalia præſtantiam & prærogativam in hoc potiſſimum fulgere, quod Evangelica graviſſimo Contritionis, & Dilectionis Dei jugo nos liberaverint. Morin. *de Pœnit. l. 8. c. 4. n. 26.*

to tell men that the Sacraments of the G
ſpel do free men from that heavy yoke
Contrition and the Love of God.

But ſuppoſing there were no ſuch Fou
dation for this Doctrine in the Coun
cil *of* Trent, *as we ſee there is*
would there be no danger to mens Salv
tion, if their Confeſſors generally told th
theſe things, and they knew it to be th
current opinion among them? Is there n
danger of falling into the ditch whe
the Blind lead the Blind, *unleſs*
General Council expreſly allow of it? I
there no danger by Empericks a
Mountebanks, *unleſs the whole* Col
ledge *of* Phyſicians *approve them? An*
of all ſorts of Empericks, *the worſt a*
ſuch Caſuiſts *and* Confeſſors. *Is ther*
no way to magnify the Sacerdotal offic
unleſs they have a Power to Trepan Sou
into eternal flames for want of true r
pentance; by making them believe th
Prieſts abſolution with bare attritio
will make all even with God? Or
thi

this Doctrine only a Decoy to draw great ſinners into your nets? And all this while is your Church innocent, which at leaſt ſees and will not reform theſe things? In A. D. 1665. 24. of September and 18. May, 1666. the Congregation of the Inquiſition at Rome under Alexander. 7. took upon them to cenſure 45. ſeveral Propoſitions of the late Caſuiſts, as ſcandalous and pernicious to the Souls of men, but not one of them relates to this Doctrine of repentance, although the Janſeniſts in France had complained of it. Whence could this ariſe but from looking on it as the Doctrine of their Church? Indeed I find that on May 5. 1667. The Pope cauſed a Decree to be publiſhed ſtraitly forbidding all perſons in their debates about Attrition, to condemn each other; but it is worth our while to underſtand, what this controverſie was, viz. Whether bare attrition doth require an act of the love of God; and although the Negative

Index Expurg: Alex. 7. n. 87. 88.

be

be there ſaid to be the more common opinion, yet the Pope would not have the others that affirmed it to be cenſured. *But not the leaſt word againſt the ſufficiency of bare* attrition. *Are any of the Books cenſured which aſſert this Doctrine? Nay, they are publiſhed with great approbations. Are any of the Defenders of it diſcountenanced? Nay, they are Perſons in the higheſt eſteem, dignity, and Authority among them. Are any cautions given to Confeſſors to beware of theſe Doctrines? Nay, theſe very Books are purpoſely written and approved for their inſtruction and uſe. And if their Church be innocent after all this, ſo was the Jewiſh Church in our Saviours time; for the corruptions that were then among them had no decree of the* Sanhedrin, *that I find, for them; it was only their* Schoolmen *and* Caſuiſts, *the* Scribes *and* Phariſees *which introduced them. And yet our Saviour thought mens Souls in danger, when he bid them be-*

ware

ware of the leaven of the Phariſees. *I confeſs when we debate the cauſes of Separation from their Communion, we think it then reaſonable to alledge no more, than what they impoſe on all to believe and practice (and we have enough of all Conſcience in that kind without going farther) but when we repreſent the hazard of Salvation to particular perſons, we may then juſtly charge them with the pernicious Doctrines and practices which are received and allowed among them, although not decreed by the Church in Councils. For otherwiſe it would be juſt, as if one ſhould ſay to a man, that asked him, whether he might ſafely travel through ſuch a Country?* yes, without doubt you may, for although there be abundance of Thieves and High-waymen, yet the Prince or the State never approved them, or gave them licence to rob Travellers. *Do you think any man would venture his perſon or his purſe, on no better ſecurity? Yet*

ſuch ſecurity as this, if it were true is all that ſuch moderate men as O. N. *or his Brethren can give as to the Roman Church; for they dare not deny the bad conſequence of the Doctrines and practices charged upon them, but only ſay,* the Church hath not decreed them. *So much I thought neceſſary to ſay to this neweſt and moſt plauſible pretence, which is made uſe of by the beſt Advocates for the Roman Church.*

And now farewel to Moderation; for the two next which appeared on the Stage againſt me, were two Jeſuits; *the one ſent over a Book, which if we look only at the bulk and thickneſs was a very ſubſtantial one, called by an odd* Antiphraſis, Reaſon and Religion: *I have endeavoured to draw off all the* Spirit *I could find in it, in the following diſcourſes, but I am forced to leave a vaſt quantity of Phlegm and* Caput Mortuum *behind. I ſhall ſay no more of him here, having occaſion to ſpeak ſo much of him in the Diſcourſes about the Principles of faith, which*

will

will in a little time be ready to appear.

The other is the ſtout Defender of Ignatius Loyola *and the whole* Order *of* Jeſuits; *What, one man undertake to defend the* Jeſuits *as to their* Principles *and* Practices! *and that in this Age, which ſo well underſtands their Maxims and Conduct! and in* England *too, where thoſe of other* Orders *and the* Secular Prieſts *love them ſo dearly! But nothing is too brave or difficult, for a* Jeſuit *to attempt, however he comes off in it. As to* Ignatius Loyola, *I will come to terms with him; if what he confeſſes as to his ignorant zeal, pious ſimplicity, frequent viſions and extaſies, extravagant preaching, unmannerly contempt of Superiours do not prove him a* Fanatick, *I am content to let him go. But what if* Ignatius *himſelf being grown old, did ſuſpect ſuch frequent extaſies and viſions for illuſions? I deſire him to look* Ribadineira, *in his larger life to that purpoſe. But this matter of* Fanaticiſm *Ribadin. vit. Ignat. l. 5. c. 20.*

must be referred to another place. I shall now only give a taſt of the Jeſuits *excellent way of defending the principles deſtructive to Government which I charged his* Order *with.*

The firſt was, that Government was ſo originally in the People, that they by their Repreſentatives may call their Soveraign to an account and alter the form of Government.

P. 38. *Now mark this Anſwer.* This principle (whatſoever truth it may have in ſpeculation) is by no means to be preached to the People, who are apt enough of themſelves to ſtretch caſes and pick quarrels with their beſt Governours, yet was it taught many Ages before the Jeſuits were ſo much as thought of. *Welfare the man for his plain-dealing; the Doctrine it ſeems is* true *enough, but the people are not fit to be truſted with the management of it, no,* not in their places and callings; *no, no, let the*

Jeſuits

Jeſuits *alone with theſe things, they know juſt the very nick of time, when to be Judges and Executioners too.*

The next principle is, the Popes power of depoſing Princes, *to which he again anſwers roundly.* You are then to know, Sir, that the Doctrine was long ago taught by almoſt all Orders and Profeſſions, Seculars, Regulars, Divines, Lawyers, before the Jeſuits were in Being. *A very Catholick Doctrine it ſeems it is! What a ſtirr do other people make with mincing this matter, I know not how; give me a man that ſpeaks out, and lets Princes underſtand what their general Doctrine is in this matter, leſt they may poſſibly be deceived, as though it were only the bold aſſertion of ſome few Perſons among them.* What wonder then *ſaith he*, if *Bellarmin* and 3. or 4. more Jeſuits were carried away with ſuch a Torrent of Doctors who went before them? *Nay, in my opinion the only* P. 39.

only wonder is, how any Perſons amon
them dare think otherwiſe, this Doctri
having as he tells us, ſo Catholick a co
ſent to the truth of it. But in earneſ
Sir, is the Doctrine true, or falſe
Nay, Sir, I beſeech you to ex
cuſe me in that: *for as he ſaith, a*
terwards about the Popes power o
abſolving Subjects, I beg leave t
wave ſuch curious controverſies:
P. 50. *What, a* Jeſuit *beg leave to wave cu*
rious controverſies! *What is become o*
all their vaſt Tomes of Scholaſtical an
Caſuiſtical Divinity? Are no curiou
controverſies *handled in them? An*
were you bred up among them and yet hat
controverſies *meerly becauſe* curious
No, no. We underſtand you better than ſo
That is only a curious controverſie
with you which endangers your ſafety, i
you ſpeak out, for it is a needleſs kind o
curioſity for a man to betray himſelf
Here in theſe practical Countries *it i*
ſometimes dangerous ſpeaking Truth in
their

their ſenſe; but at ſuch a ſpeculative place as Rome is, there thoſe may be wholeſome and Catholick Truths, which here are but niceties and curioſities. But doth he not ſay, the Jeſuits have ſolemnly renounced the Doctrine? Yes, but have a care how far you believe him: we poor ſimple Iſlanders might underſtand by this, that they had declared it to be falſe and pernicious. There is no ſuch matter I will aſſure you, but upon the ſtirrs in France they renounced the publiſhing it, they renounced it as they were in France, but thought it good Doctrine at Rome: they are forbidden to treat any more of it, becauſe of the odiouſneſs of it to Princes, and that is all the renouncing they ever meant. P. 40.

The third Principle is, the lawfulneſs of killing Kings, as to which, he ſaith, he cannot name the perſon that ever taught it in thoſe Terms: a good reaſon for that, becauſe when they would have them killed

they

they call them Tyrants. *And ſo*
grants Dominicus Soto *and* Maria
have aſſerted it, he might have nam
more if he had pleaſed. I could not deſ
a more pleaſant task than to purſue h
through the remainder of his diſcourſ
wherein he undertakes to vindicate the J
ſuits practices, but theſe have been
much expoſed by men of their own Re
gion, that I may ſpare my pains in th
Preface; and we may eaſily gueſs ho
hard he was put to it, when he mak
the letter of the Biſhop *of* Angelopol
to be forged at Port-Royal *by the* Ja
ſeniſts. *And thus he hath ſhifted t*
fault from the Indies *to* Europe, a
to vindicate ſome Papiſts there fro
P. 21. *Idolatry, he charges others here with forge*
And yet to this as a full Anſwer, the la
Anſwerer *of the* Seaſonable Diſcour
doth referr us. And out of his admirab
learning and skill in Hiſtory deſires h
Adverſary, for his ſatisfaction that the
can be no danger of Reſuming Abby Lan

of Popery ſhould return, to go into *Germany* where there are ſo many Papiſt and Proteſtant Princes, Noble men and Gentlemen, that have (eſpecially ſince the Treaty at *Munſter*) either Biſhopricks, Abbeys or the like confirmed to them by the Pope. *How! confirmed to them by the Pope! what will not theſe men dare to ſay? I perceive* Ignorance *ſerves them for other purpoſes than meerly to be the* Mother of Devotion. *If at leaſt this worthy Author could be Ignorant of ſo notorious a thing as* Pope Innocents Bull *publiſhed on purpoſe to* Null the Treaty at *Munſter*, *as* prejudicial to the Catholick Religion, to the Apoſtolical See, to Churches and other Holy Places and Perſons and Eccleſiaſtical Rights. *In the body of the* Bull *he ſaith*, that his Nuncio there (*who* P. 13.

Sanctiſſimi Domini N. D. Innocentii Divina Providentia Papæ 10. Declaratio nullitatis Articulorum Nuperæ Pacis Germaniæ Religioni Catholicæ, Sedi Apoſtolicæ, Eccleſiis, aliiſque locis piis ac Perſonis, & Juribus Eccleſiaſticis quomodo libet præjudicialium. Romæ ex Typographia Reverend. Cameræ Apoſtolicæ. A. D. 1651.

was afterwards Pope Alexander *the ſe-venth*) did proteſt againſt theſe Articles, as void, null, unjuſt, and agreed upon by perſons that had no power, and that they were to be ſo looked on by all. But the Pope did not think this ſufficient, *but declares* all thoſe Articles that related to liberty of Religion, Church-lands, or any Eccleſiaſtical Rights, or brought any the leaſt prejudice to them or might be thought or pretended ſo to do, to be null, void, invalid, unjuſt, damned, reprobate, vain, and without any force or power, and that they ſhall remain ſo for ever; and that no perſon, though never ſo much ſworn to obſerve thoſe articles ſhall be bound by ſuch oath; no right, title, plea, preſcription, ſhall accrue to any by vertue of them: and therefore out of the Plenitude of Apoſtolical power he doth abſolutely damn, repro-

reprobate, null and caſſate all thoſe articles and proteſts before God of the nullity of them; and reſtores all perſons and places to their ancient poſſeſſions notwithſtanding them, *with very much more to the ſame purpoſe. This was dated at* Rome apud Sanctam Mariam Majorem ſub Annulo Piſcatoris die 26 Novemb. *and ſolemnly publiſhed there the third of* Jan. 1651. *in the eighth year of his* Pontificat. *Call you this, Sir, the Popes confirming them! Is it credible that he who in the beginning of his Anſwer had charged the late Proteſtant Books, (which he moſt ingeniouſly calls* Libels) *to be* crammed with nothing elſe but what we know to be falſe, *ſhould within a few Pages have the confidence to affirm in the face of the world ſo notorious an untruth? But I leave this ingenious Author, to be Chaſtiſed for this and other his extravagancies, by his worthy Adverſary, and return to my own.*

After all these unsuccessful attempts at last the Knight *himself resolves to encounter the* Dragon; *and accordingly he buckles on his armour, mounts his stead, and, according to all ancient and modern Pictures of the combat, directs his lance into the very mouth of it; wisely considering, if the head were mortally wounded, the whole Body would fall to the ground. After him at a convenient distance follows his Squire* I. S. *who had a particular spight at the* Dragons Tayl, *and without fear or wit falls unmercifully upon it, and in his own opinion, hath chopt it into a thousand pieces. But such mischievous creatures whose strength lies scattered in all their parts, do often rise up when they are triumphed over as dead, and give their most deadly wounds, when they are thought to lye gasping for breath.*

It happened that when T. G's. *Answer to the first part of my Book came out, I was before engaged in the Defence of the Protestant principles of faith against the*

Guide

Guide in Controverſies and E. W. (*the Author of* thoſe two learned Treatiſes *as* T. G. *calls them*, Proteſtancy without Principles, and Religion and Reaſon) *part of which being then in the Preſs, I was forced to go through with that, before I could take his Book into conſideration. And thereupon I reſolved to diſpatch all thoſe which relate to the Principles of Faith together; and then to proceed to the Principles of Worſhip in anſwer to him, which (God willing) I intend as ſoon as the former part is finiſhed.* P. 312.

All that I ſhall take notice of him here, is to repreſent the ingenuity of his dealing with me in his Preface, wherein he charges me with diſſenting from the Doctrine of the Church of *England* in accuſing the Church of *Rome* of Idolatry. *And by this one Inſtance I deſire the Reader to judge what Candour and ſincerity he is to expect in his Book.*

For the ſenſe of the Church of England *I appealed to the* Book of Homilies:

lies: *not to any doubtful, or general, or ſingle paſſage therein, but to the deſign of one of the largeſt and moſt elaborate* Homilies *in the whole* Book; *conſiſting of three ſeveral parts, the laſt of which is ſaid not to be meerly for the People but for the inſtruction of thoſe who were to teach them. The deſign of that laſt part is thus ſet down.* 1. That Popiſh Images and the Idols of the Gentils are all one concerning themſelves. 2. That they have been and be worſhipped in our time in like form and manner as were the Idols of the Gentils. And for that Idolatry ſtandeth chiefly in the mind, it ſhall in this part firſt be proved that our Image-maintainers, have had, and have the ſame opinions and judgement of Saints whoſe Images they have made and worſhipped as the Gentils Idolaters had of their Gods; and afterwards ſhall be declared that our Image-main-

Book of Hom. ſecond Tome. p. 46.

maintainers and worſhippers have uſed and uſe the ſame outward rites, and manner of honouring, and worſhipping their Images, as the Gentils did uſe before their Idols, and that therefore they commit Idolatry, as well inwardly as outwardly, as did the wicked Gentils Idolaters; *and this that* Homily *is intended for the proof of: which it doth very fully. But, ſaith* T. G., why did I not appeal for the ſenſe of our Church to the 39. Articles? *As though the approbation of* the Book of Homilies *were not one of them, viz. the* 35. The ſecond Book of Homilies the ſeveral Titles whereof we have joyned under this Article (*among which Titles the ſecond is this of the Peril of Idolatry*) doth contain a godly and wholeſome Doctrine and neceſſary for theſe times. *Which Articles were not only allowed and approved by the Queen, but confirmed by the*

Sub-

ſubſcription of the hand of the Arch-biſhop and Biſhops of the upper Houſe, and by the ſubſcription of the whole Clergy in the nether Houſe of Convocation A. D. 1571. *Now I deſire* T. G. *to reſolve me whether men of any common underſtanding would have ſubſcribed to this* Book of Homilies *in this manner, if they had believed the main Doctrine and deſign of one of them had been falſe and pernicious? as they muſt have done if they had thought the practice of the* Roman Church *to be free from* Idolatry. *I will put the caſe that any of the Biſhops then had thought the charge of* Idolatry *had been unjuſt, and that it had ſubverted the foundation of Eccleſiaſtical Authority, that there could have been no Church, or right ordination if the* Roman Church *had been guilty of* Idolatry; *would they have inſerted this into the Articles, when it was in their power to have left it out? and that the* Homilies contained a wholeſome and Godly Doctrine, *which in*

their

their consciences they believed to be false and pernicious? I might as well think that the Council *of* Trent *would have allowed* Calvins Institutions, *as containing a* wholesome and Godly Doctrine; *as that men so perswaded would have allowed it the* Homily against the Peril of Idolatry. *And how is it possible to understand the sense of our Church better, than by such publick and authentick acts of it, which all Persons who are in any place of trust in the Church must subscribe, and declare their approbation of them? This* Homily *hath still continued the same, the Article the very same, and if so they must acknowledge this hath been, and is to this day the sense of our Church. But saith* T. C. the subscribing the Book of Homilies, as containing a godly and wholesome Doctrine, doth not evince that every particular Doctrine contained in it is such. *Be it so: but I hope it doth evince that the Subscribers did not think*

the main Doctrine of any one Homily *to be false? Surely there is a great deal of difference between some particular passages and expressions in these* Homilies, *and that which is the main design and Foundation of any one of them. But in this case we are to observe, that they who deny the* Church *of* Rome *to be guilty of Idolatry, do not only look on the Charge as false, but as of dangerous Consequence; and therefore although men may subscribe to a* Book *in general as containing wholesome and godly Doctrine, though they be not so certain of the Truth of every passage in it, yet they can never do it with a good conscience if they believe any great and considerable part of the Doctrine therein contained to be false and dangerous. Such a subscription would be as apparently shuffling and dishoneſt as is the evasion of this Testimony which* T. G. *makes use of for want of a better.*

I shall in the next place shew the current Doctrine of the Church ever since the Re-

for-

formation to have been agreeable to this Homily *of the* Peril of Idolatry. *In the* Injunctions *publiſhed by* K. Edward VI. A. D. 1547. *the extirpation of Popery is called* the ſuppreſſion of Idolatry and Superſtition. *In the ſecond year of* Edward VI. Arch-biſhop Cranmer *publiſhed his* Articles *of* Viſitation, *whereof the 6. and the laſt are about* the taking away Images, Pictures, and all other Monuments of feigned miracles, Pilgrimages, Idolatry and Superſtition. *In the ſecond* Liturgy *by* Edward VI. *after the Communion, was a* Rubrick *annexed, in which* the Adoration of the Hoſt is expreſly called Idolatry. *This is that very* Rubrick, *of which* T. G., *according to his excellent skill in the offices of our Church, ſaith* it is not yet more then a dozen years ſince it was inſerted into the Communion Book; *which he might have found above a* 100. *years before in the Book of* Edward VI. P. 214.

In the Injunctions *of Queen* Eliza-
beth, A. D. 1559. *Art.* 2. *and* 23.
all Shrines, Tables, Pictures, &c.
are commanded to be taken away
and deſtroyed and all other Monu-
ments of feigned miracles, Idola-
try and Superſtition. *And that we*
may not think it was only a ſudden heat
at the firſt Reformation which made them
charge the Church of Rome *with Idola-*
try, long after in A form of Thanks-
giving *in the* 37. *of Queen* Elizabeth
A. D. 1594. Popery is called that
Idolatrous Religion: *as it was in the*
Beginning of her Reign in the excellent
Apology for the Church of England.
And I deſire him, or any one elſe, to
produce any one Biſhop or Divine of note
in the Church of England, *who during*
all her Reign did deny the Church of
Rome *to be guilty of* Idolatry. But
why then was it not inſerted in
the 39. Articles? *in which* T. G. *ob-*
P. 197. *ſerves*, the Adoration of Images is
not

not rejected as Idolatry, but only as a fond thing, vainly invented, nor as repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, but as being rather repugnant to the word of God, which plainly gives us to understand, that they had done their endeavours to find a command but could not. *A most ingenious Criticism! when himself and all others of their Divines yield that* adoration of images, *which our Church charges them with, Art.* 22. (*viz. not barely worshipping but* adoration of images) *to be* Idolatry *and plainly repugnant to Scripture. Were the composers of our Articles so senseless as not to think Idolatry repugnant to Scripture; or not to think adoration of images to be Idolatry; or not to think the Church of* Rome *guilty of it, when the Article saith* The Romish Doctrine concerning worshipping and adoration as well of Images as of Reliques, *&c? It is not meerly the practice used in the* Church

Church of Rome, *but their very* Doctrine *concerning* adoration of images *which is here charged; and can any Church teach adoration of images and not be guilty of Idolatry? And for his Criticism about being* rather repugnant, *it had been utterly lost if he had looked into the Latin Articles where the words are,* immo verbo Dei contradicit; *whereby it appears that* rather *is not used as a term of diminution, but of a more vehement affirmation.*

I now come to the exceptions he takes to the particular Testimonies I produced of the most eminent Bishops and Divines of our Church, ever since the Reformation, who have all concurred in this charge of Idolatry. Two parts in three he excepts against as incompetent witnesses in the case: how few of the Jury would any Malefactor allow if such frivolous exceptions might serve his turn?

The two first he excepts against are the two Arch-Bishops Whitgift *and* Abbot as Puritanically inclined. *But*

as

as it unhappily falls out, one of them was never mentioned by me, and the other never till now ſuſpected for a Puritan. *The* Abbot *I mentioned was not* George Abbot Arch-Biſhop of Canterbury, *but* Robert Abbot *Biſhop of* Salisbury; *and it is the firſt time we ever heard that a* Biſhop of Salisbury was ſuſpended from his Metropolitical juriſdiction. *But they of the Church of* Rome *have a faculty of doing greater wonders with five words, than Changing a Biſhop into an Arch-Biſhop. I hope he underſtands the Church he is of, better than that he hath left, or elſe we are like to have a ſad account of Hiſtory from him. But why I beſeech you, after all his zeal and indefatigable pains for the* Church *of* England, *muſt* Arch-Biſhop Whitgift *be thrown away to the* Puritans? *If he had proved* T. C. *at the ſame time Arch-Biſhop of* Canterbury, *there might have been ſome reaſon to ſuſpect* Whitgift *to have been of the* Puritan *ſide;*

for

for all the world know they were gre
adversaries on that very account of th
Puritan cause. But was not *Whitgi*
for the *Lambeth* Articles? *And wh*
then? Are the Dominicans Puritan
and no Papists? *If your Church may ha*
liberty not to determin those nice point
why may not ours? and so both parties r
main of our Church, as long as they co
tradict no received Articles among u
But the Lambeth-Articles *were nev*
intended for any more than as Respons
Prudentum *to silence disputes in th*
university. And I believe none of th
Puritan *party after that, took* Arch
Bishop Whitgift *to be a Patron of the*
cause.

But if these will not serve his turn,
have others ready, whom for meer sham
he will not say were Puritans, *or* Pu
ritanically inclined. *And the first o*
these is an Arch-Bishop *too, and tha*
is Arch-Bishop Bancroft; *and if h*
be cast out for a Puritan, *surely there nev*

wa

was any Biſhop of the Church *of* England. *In his Sermon preached at* Pauls Croſs *on* 1 John 4. 1. *he hath theſe words ſpeaking of the* Papiſts. The Po- P. 30.
piſh falſe Prophets will ſuffer the people to try nothing, but do teach them wholly to depend on them; and to that purpoſe they have indeed three notable ſleights. Firſt they forbid them the reading of the Scriptures. And the better to be obeyed therein they will not permit the Scriptures to be Tranſlated into the Vulgar Tongue. Whereof it came to paſs that the people were ſo eaſily ſeduced, and drawn from Chriſt to the Pope; from his merits to the Saints, and their own merits; from his bloody ſacrifice, whereby only ſins are remitted, to their moſt dry and fruitleſs ſacrifice; from the ſpiritual food of his Body and Blood, unto a carnal and Caper-

naitical Tranſubſtantiation; from the calling upon his name to an Invocation of Saints: and from their ſure truſt and confidence in his death, to a vain imagination of the vertue of their Maſſes, Pilgrimages, Pardons, and I know not what intolerable Superſtition and Idolatry. *I hope* Arch-Biſhop Bancroft *may for once paſs for no* Puritan *with* T. G. *But what will he ſay, if the only perſons he produces as moſt partial of his ſide, do give in evidence againſt him?* Biſhop Mountague *is the firſt, whoſe words are theſe* (Appeal p. 263.) *in the Book cited by him.* Our predeceſſors and Fathers coming late out of Popery, living near unto Papiſts and Popiſh times, converſing with them, having been nuzzled and brought up amongſt them and knowing that Images uſed to be crept unto, incenſed, worſhipped, and adored among them, &c. *What thinks he, is not this all one as to charge*

them

them with Idolatry? And more plainly in his former Book, But whatsoever you say, however you qualify the thing with gentle words, we say in your practice you far exceed; and give them that honour which is *Latria* a part of Divine respect and worship. *And afterwards saith*, the people go to it with downright adoration, and your new Schools defend that the same respect is due to the representer, as must be given to the representee. So that the Crucifix is to be reverenced with the the self-same honour that Christ Jesus is. A blasphemy not heard of till *Thomas Aquinas* set it on foot. Clear these enormities, and others like these, then come and we may talk and soon agree concerning honour and respect unto Reliques or Images of Saints, or Christ; till then we cannot answer it unto our Maker, to give his honour un-

Answer to the *Gagg.* p. 319.

to a Creature. *His next is* Pet. Heylin; *And now I hope we have at laſt hit upon a man far enough from being a* Puritan; *yet this very Perſon gives plain evidence againſt him. For in his 4th. Sermon on the* Tares *preached at*
P. 110. White-Hall *January* 27. 1638. *He hath theſe words.* So it is alſo in the point of Images, firſt introduced into the Church for ornament, Hiſtory, and imitation. Had they ſtaid there it had been well, and no fault found with them.---- But when the Schools began to State it, that the ſame Veneration was to be afforded to the Type and Prototype, then came the Doctrine to the growth. When and by whom, and where it was firſt ſo ſtated is not eaſie to determine, and indeed not neceſſary. It is enough that we behold it in the fruits. And what fruits think you could it bear, but moſt groſs Idolatry, greater than which was ne-

ver

ver known among the Gentils? Witneſs their praying not before, but to the Crucifix, and calling on the very Croſs, the wooden and material Croſs, both to increaſe their righteouſneſs and remit their ſins. And for the Images of the Saints, they that obſerve with what laborious Pilgrimages, magnificent proceſſions, ſolemn offerings, and in a word, with what affections, prayers, and humble bendings of the body, they have been and are worſhipped in the Church of *Rome*, might very eaſily conceive that She was once again relapſed into her ancient Paganiſm. *With much more to the ſame purpoſe. His only perſon remaining, is Mr.* Thorndike, *a man of excellent Learning and great piety, but if we ſhould grant, that he held ſome thing ſingular in this matter; what is that to the conſtant opinion of our Church? and yet even Mr.* Thorndike

dike *himself in a paper sent by him t*
some whom T. G. *know's, not lon*
before his death, saith, That, t
pray to Saints for those things which
only God can give (as all Papist do
is by the proper sense of the word
down-right Idolatry. If they say,
their meaning is by a figure only t
desire them to procure their request
of God: How dare any Christian
trust his soul with that Church
which teaches that which must need
be Idolatry in all that understan
not the figure? *So that upon the whol*
matter T. G. *cannot produce any on*
Person of our Church that hath clearly an
wholly acquitted the Church of Rome *fro*
the charge of Idolatry. It seems then ou
Church hath been made up of Puritans
T. G's. *sense of them. But if these do no*
satisfy him what doth he think of the Arch
Bishop *and* Bishops *and Clergy of th*
Convocation. A. D. 1640. *Were a*
these Puritans *too? And yet in the seventh*
Canon

Canon *they have theſe words.* And albeit at the time of Reforming this Church from that groſs Superſtition of Popery, it was carefully provided that all means ſhould be uſed to root out of the minds of the people, both the inclination thereto and memory thereof; eſpecially of the Idolatry committed in the Maſs, for which cauſe all Popiſh Altars were demoliſhed, *&c. What can more expreſs the ſenſe of our Church, than the concurrent opinion of* Arch-Biſhops, Biſhops *and* Clergy *of both* Provinces *met in* Convocation? *When we ſee they ſo lately, charged the* Church *of* Rome *with* Idolatry.

Let us now conſider what exceptions he takes againſt the other witneſſes produced by me. Jewel, Bilſon, Davenant, *all eminent Biſhops of our Church and of great learning, are caſt away at once, as incompetent Perſons. But why ſo? Why, ſaith* T. G. they were all excepted

cepted againſt by our late Soveraign K. *Charles* I. in his third paper to *Henderſon*. *That is a ſhrewd prejudice indeed to their Authority to be rejected by a Prince of ſo excellent a judgement and ſo Cordial a friend to the* Church *of* England. *But it is good to be ſure whether it be ſo or no. All that he ſaith of* Biſhop *Jewel* is this, and though I much reverence Biſhop *Jewel's* memory, I never thought him infallible. *So then, he muſt be* Puritanically inclined; *but whence does that follow? not ſurely* from the Kings reverencing his memory, *for that were to reflect upon the King himſelf; not* from his not thinking him Infallible. *For I dare ſay, the King never thought the* Pope infallible; *muſt he needs therefore think him a* Puritan? *Surely never man was ſuch a Friend to the* Puritans *as this* T. G. *who without any ground gives them away ſome of the greateſt honours of our Church, and (if the*

Teſti-

Teſtimony laſt cited be of any force to prove one a Puritan, *) all mankind, and himſelf too: for I plainly perceive by this Preface that he is not infallible. Yet for all this we will not let go* Jewel, *no nor* Bilſon, Davenant, White, Uſher, Downam, *what ever* T. G. *ſaith againſt them. Indeed K.* Charles *excepts againſt* Bilſon *for his Principles of civil Government, but not a word of his diſaffection to the Church of* England: *For* Biſhop Davenant, *the King ſaith* he is none of thoſe to whom he appealed, or would ſubmit unto, *and with very good reaſon, for the King had appealed to* the practice of the primitive Church, and the Univerſal conſent of Fathers; *therefore Biſhop* Davenant *was a* Puritan. *It ſeems they have been all* Puritans *ſince* the Primitive times; *and I hope the* Church *of* Rome *then hath good ſtore of them, for that is far enough from* the Fathers *or the* Primitive Church. *But how*

comes Biſhop White *in for a* Puritan, *being ſo great a Friend of* Arch-Biſhop Laud; *why, forſooth,* Heylin reports that for licenſing Biſhop *Mountagu's Appello Cæſarem,* it was ſaid, that White was turned Black. *And canſt thou for thy heart, good Reader, expect a more pregnant proof? It was a notable ſaying, and it is great pity, the Hiſtorian did not preſerve the memory of the Author of it; but by whom was it ſaid? that muſt be ſuppoſed by the* Puritans; *and could none but they be the Authors of ſo witty a ſaying? But ſuppoſe they were the* Puritans *that ſaid it? it is plain then, they thought him no ſound* Puritan, *for they hold no falling from Grace. All then that can be inferred from this witty ſaying is, that* White *ſunk in his eſteem among them by this Act. And is it not poſſible for them to have an eſteem for thoſe who are not of their own Party? Concerning* Arch-Biſhop Uſher, *Dr.* Heylin *was known to be too much his enemy, to be allowed to give a Character of him: and his name will*

not want a due veneration as long as Learning and piety have any eſteem among us.

But he is moſt troubled what to do with ſix that remain, viz. King James, Biſhop Andrews, Arch-Biſhop Laud, Iſaac Caſaubon, Doct. Field, *and* Doct. Jackſon; *theſe he could not for ſhame faſten the name of* Puritans *upon (as he doth with ſcorn on* Biſhop Downam, Reynolds, Whitaker, *and* Fulk; *whoſe teſtimonies I ſaid to prevent cavils, I need not to produce although they are all capable of ſufficient vindication.) For* King James, *he ſaith,* that in the place cited by me he ſaith expreſly, that what he condemns is adoring of Images, praying to them, and imagining a kind of Sanctity in them, all which are deteſted by Catholicks. *Was ever man put to ſuch miſerable ſhifts? Are not theſe* King James *his words.* But for worſhipping either them, (Reliques) or Images, I muſt account it damnable

nable Idolatry. *And doth not* King James *a little after take off their diſtinctions and evaſions in theſe words*, and they worſhip (forſooth) the Images of things in Being, and the Image of the true God. But Scripture forbiddeth to worſhip the Image of any thing that God created. Yea the Image of God himſelf is not only expreſly forbidden to be worſhipped but even to be made. Let them therefore that maintain this doctrine, anſwer it to Chriſt at the latter day, when he ſhall accuſe them of Idolatry; And then I doubt if he will be paid with ſuch nice Sophiſtical diſtinctions. *Is all this nothing but to charge them with ſuch practices which they deteſt? Doth he not mention* their Doctrine, *and* their diſtinctions? *Did not* King James *underſtand what he ſaid, and what they did? It is plain he charges them with Idolatry in what they did,*

did, which was that I brought his Testimony for. The like answer he gives to the rest of them, viz. that they charged them, with what they thought they did, but the Papists deny that they do any such thing: i. e. *in plain Terms, they charge them with* Idolatry, *but the* Papists *deny they commit it. And so they do when I charge them with it; so that* T. G. *by the very same reason might have acquitted me from charging them with it, and have spared his Book. Is not this now an Admirable way of proving, that they do not charge them with* Idolatry, *because the* Papists *deny they commit it? Who meddles with what they profess they do, or do not? I was to shew what these Persons charged them with. And do any of these excuse them by saying any doctrine of theirs was contrary to these particulars? do they not expressly set themselves to disprove their distinctions upon which their doctrine is founded? and shew the vanity of them because their*

open

open and allowed practices do plainly contradict them; and shew that they do give divine honour to Images however in words they deny it. But this way of defending them is, as if those whom St. Paul charges that they professed that they knew God but in works they denied him, *should reply to him, how can we deny him in our Works, since we profess him in our Words? Just so saith* T. G. *how can they be charged with Idolatry, since they profess to do no such thing? As though such persons, as those I mentioned, did not understand both what the Papists said for themselves and what they did notwithstanding. And now I join with* T. G. in desiring the Reader may be judge between us, whether I have betrayed my trust in pretending to defend the Church of *England*; and whether in charging the Church of *Rome* with Idolatry I have contradicted the sense of it? *since I have made it appear that* her most true

and

and Genuin ſons; *the moſt remote from all ſuſpicion of diſaffection to her, or inclination to* Puritaniſm, *have concurred in the ſame charge which I undertook to make good.*

But there is one blow yet remaining in his Preface, which I muſt endeavour to ward off, otherwiſe it will be a terrible one to the Church of England; *for* by this charge of Idolatry, he makes me to ſubvert the very foundation of Eccleſiaſtical Authority in it. *This it is to charge home.* For, *ſaith he*, it being a received Maxime and not being denyable by any man of common ſenſe, that no man can give to another that which he hath not himſelf, it lies open to the Conſcience of every man, that if the Church of *Rome* be guilty of Hereſie, much more if guilty of Idolatry, it falls under the Apoſtles excommunication. (*Gal.* 1. 8.) and ſo remains deprived of the Lawful Au-

thority

thority to use and exercise the power of Orders; and consequently the Authority of Governing, preaching and Administring the Sacraments, which those of the *Church* of *England* challenge to themselves, as deriv'd from the *Church* of *Rome*, can be no true and lawful Jurisdiction, but usurped and Anti-Christian. *And so farewel to the Church of* England, *if the Church of* Rome *were not more kind in this case than* T. G. *is. Hetherto we have seen his skill in the affairs of our Church, and now we shall see just as much in the Doctrine of his own. For doth not the* Council *of* Trent *make* Orders a Sacrament? *and one of those which doth imprint* an indelible character? *and doth not that Council pronounce* an Anathema *against those*, that denyed the validity of the Sacrament administred by one in mortal sin, in case he observes the essentials of it? *How then can* T. G. *escape excommuni-*

Concil. Trident. Sess. 7. can. 9. sess. 23. can. 4.

cation

cation from his own Church, that denies the validity of the Sacrament *of* Orders *in case of the sin of the Givers of it? If the validity of the Sacrament doth not depend on the worth or quality of the Ministers of it but upon the essentials and the institution of Christ, how can the fault of the persons hinder the conveyance of that Authority, which they are only the bare instruments to convey? Doth* T. G. *think so in all other Sacraments? as in case of Baptism; that supposing the Ministers of it have been guilty of* Heresie *or* Idolatry, *the Sacrament loses its effect? Well fare then the* Donatists, *whose opinion this was, and in whom it hath been condemned by the Church. If it be not so in other* Sacraments *how comes it to be thus in* Orders? *which he must acknowledge, to be as much a* Sacrament *as* Baptism; *or else he must renounce the* Council *of* Trent. *And it is observable, that the very argument used by the* Donatists *and others, was the same which* T. G. *here produces,* viz. his common maxim

of Reaſon, and not denyable by any man of common ſenſe that no man can give to another, that which he hath not himſelf; *to which this anſwer was given, that the* Inſtrument *was not the* giver, *but the firſt* Inſtitutor, *and in caſe the Miniſter keep to the Inſtitution, the Grace of the Sacrament may be conveyed by him though he hath it not himſelf.*

V. Vaſquez. in 3. p. Thom. diſp. 137. c. 3. n. 20.

But, methinks, if T. G. *had forgotten the Doctrine of the* Council *of* Trent, *he might have looked into ſome one or other of their own Authors to have informed himſelf better of their Doctrine in this matter.* Vaſquez *hath a Chapter on purpoſe to prove that* an Heretical, excommunicated, ſuſpended Biſhop is a ſufficient Miniſter of Ordination; *and ſaith* that all the Schoolmen and Summiſts are agreed in it, and that there can be no doubt at all made of it. *And did none of theſe men underſtand the principle that is undenyable by any man of common ſenſe? what a back-blow is this to thoſe of his*

Vaſquez. in 3. p. Th. diſp. 243. c. 1.

his own Church? for Vaſquez *ſaith* this is determined as a matter of faith among them, that the validity of a Sacrament doth not depend on the probity or faith of the Miniſter. And he denies it to be in the power of the Church to hinder the effect of ordination in an excommunicated Biſhop, becauſe it cannot blot out his Character, or take away his power. Eſtius *ſaith*, that no Crime how great ſoever, whether hæreſie, Schiſm, or Apoſtaſie, no cenſure how heavy ſoever, as excommunication, can hinder the validity of ordination by a Biſhop, although it be of thoſe who are not ſubject to his jurisdiction, in caſe he obſerves the lawful rites of ordination as to the eſſence of the Sacrament; *for this reaſon*, becauſe ordination belongs to the power of Order, which being once received can never be loſt; but thoſe things which belong to Jurisdiction, as ab-

Eſt. in Sententi. l. 4. diſti. 25. ſect. 3.

solution and excommunication, have no effect, where that Jurisdiction is taken away. *And this Doctrine they all ground upon St* Augustins *discourse against the* Donatists; *and upon the practice of the* Church *at that time which did receive those who were ordained among the* Donatists, *without scrupling their Orders; as not only appears by the testimony of St.* Augustin *but by the decree of an* African Council *to that purpose; and that not only at first, but when the Schism was Grown inveterate. And yet* Francis Hallier *a late Doctor of the* Sorbon, *tells us*, that the *Donatists* were not barely Schismaticks, but they were adjudged hereticks, for asserting that the efficacy of Sacraments did depend upon the quality of the persons, and not upon the merits of Christ. *The same Author vehemently disputes against those*, who assert that the power of Order can be lost by the sin of the person, *and shews*

Aug. l. 2. c. Epist. Parmen. c. 13. 17. c. Donat. l 1. c. 1. l. 3 c. 10.

Aug. Epist. 50. Epist. 162. c. Cresc. l. 2. c. 11. 12. Codex Can. Eccles. Afric. c. 68. Apud. Balsamon. Et Zonar. c. 71. Hallier de ordin. sacris. p. 2. Sect. 4. c. 5. §. 1. n. 4.

ſhews that Doctrine hath been condemned by ſeveral Councils *before that of* Trent; *as of* Arles, *of* Orleans *and* Conſtance: *and undertakes to anſwer all the inſtances brought from Antiquity to the contrary; as either underſtood of ſuch hereticks, which did not retain the eſſentials of the Sacrament or only implying the fault committed in giving or receiving them at the hands of ſuch perſons, but not any invalidity in the Sacrament it ſelf. And afterwards he proves that* Hereticks are capable of ordination. *But if theſe, and many others of their later Writers will not ſatisfy him, I deſire him to conſult their more ancient Authors,* Thom. Aquinas *determins that* Hereticks and thoſe who are cut off from the Church, may give orders as well as adminiſter other Sacraments, *the reaſon he gives is*, that a power in Conſecration is given to a Biſhop, which can never be taken from him, *although he will not allow it to be called a* Character. *For ſeveral, eſpe-*

P. 2. ſect. 3. c. 2. ſect. 5. 6 7.

Sect. 4. c. 5. ſect. 1.

To. Aquin. ſuppl. q. 38. art. 2.

especially of the ancient Schoolmen *would not have consecration to imprint a* new Character; *but they were never able to give an intelligible account of what they meant by the* Character *as distinct from that Sacramental power which was conveyed by* consecration *and they granted to be* indelible *as the other was, some making it an* extension *of the* Character *of Priesthood, others a bare* extrinsecal denomination *added to it; but however they held it such as could no more be taken away than the* Character of Priesthood. Cardinal Bonaventure *saith*, that the validity of Sacraments among Hereticks, was a Question much in dispute among the ancient Doctors, but that it hath been determined by St. *Augustin*, that they are valid if they preserve the essentials of them: *and in the* matter of ordination *he saith*, that the power of Orders, although it be not a distinct Character, yet because it is built upon, it can no more

Bonav. sent. l. 4. dist. 25. q. 2.

be

be taken away than the Character it ſelf: but whatever is founded upon Juriſdiction as the power of excommunication and abſolution may be taken away. *But I need not mention any more particular Writers, ſince* Morinus *acknowledges*, that for 400. years the opinion of the validity of Orders conferred by Heretiçks, hath only obtained in the Roman Church. *Before that time, he proves at large that it was more diſputable, as appears by the* Maſter *of the* Sentences, *who accounts it a* perplexed and almoſt inſoluble difficulty becauſe of the different opinions of Doctors about it; *but afterwards* St. Auguſtins opinion *was generally received both among the* Schoolmen *and* Canoniſts; *and is now become a matter of faith in the Roman Church at leaſt by conſequence, ſince the* Decrees *of* Councils. *And although* Morinus *will not allow* that any decree of their Church hath paſſed in this matter, *yet he ſaith*, there

Morin. de Sacris Ordinat. par. 3. Exercit. 5. c. 1. n. 12

there hath been so long and so universal a consent of Doctors in this point, that it ought to be instead of a Law, which they ought not to violate. *By this we may judge of the learning and skill of* T. G. *in the Doctrine of his own Church.*

Exercit. 5. c. 8. n. 7.

But if he would not look into the Controversal Writers of their Church, yet if he had but searched into the practice of the Church *either in ancient or modern times, he would have been ashamed to have made use of such an Argument to overthrow all Ecclesiastical Authority among us. I grant that in some tumultuous Ages of the Church, Ordinations have been adjudged null through the defaults of the Persons, but then it was meerly for breaking the* Canons *of the Church; so it was in the case of* Formosus, *for breaking the* Canons *against the* Translations of Bishops; *in the case of* Ebbo Arch-Bishop of Rhemes, whose ordinations were nulled by *Hincmarus* and the Council of *Soissons*, for not being

being Canonically *reſtored after depoſition but upon appeal to the* Pope *they were pronounced valid : in the Caſe of* Pope Conſtantine *for precepitating* Orders *to ſecure the Popedom ; in the famous caſe of* Photius, *whoſe ordination was declared Null by the oppoſite faction on the ſame grounds ; but all theſe things were done in troubleſome times, when one party ſought a pretence againſt the other. But if we regard the more general practice of the Church, we ſhall find when far greater objections than theſe were made, yet Ordinations have been allowed ; although made by* Hereticks. *I ſhall offer him the faireſt terms he can deſire, and for the practice of the* Church *referr him to his own dear ſecond* Council *of* Nice, *and the* modern *practice of the* Roman Church. *The Queſtion of the validity of Ordination by* Hereticks *was at large debated in the firſt action of the ſecond* Council *of* Nice, *upon the ſubmiſſion of* Baſilius, Theodorus, *and* Theodoſius, Hypatius *and*

others who had been Bishops of the oppo-site party, which John *the* Vicar *of the* Orient *there declared* to be worse than any former heresie: *upon which the Question was proposed, whether upon renouncing their heresie they might be received as Bishops, and the orders be allowed of those who were ordained by them during their Heresie?* Hypatius *appealed* to the custom of the Church; *then the Canons of Councils and writings of the Fathers were brought into Council:* Tarasius *produced the* Canon *of the* Council *of* Nice, *allowing the* Ordinations *of the* Cathari, *and* the imposition of hands *there mentioned he understands only for* benediction, *and not for* ordination: *and the* Council *of* Ephesus *making no distinction between those ordained by* Nestorians *and others; (for therein the force of that third* Canon *must lye which* Tarasius *thought so plain) from* St. Basil, *allowing those Bishops which communicated with* Isoes *or* Zoius

and

and Saturninus; *from the* Council *of* Epheſus *allowing the* Orders *of the* Meſſaliani *or* Euchitæ; *from the* Council *of* Chalcedon *allowing the* Biſhops *upon their repentance, which had joyned with* Dioſcorus: *and more particularly, for thoſe* which had been ordained by Heretical Biſhops, *it was there ſhewed, that* Anatolius *the Preſident of the fourth* Council *was ordained by* Dioſcorus *in the preſence of* Eutyches; *that* John Biſhop *of* Hieruſalem *after he had renounced the* Acephaliſts *by whom he was ordained, was received and ſubmitted to as* Biſhop *by the* Orthodox; *that many of thoſe who ſat in the ſixth* Council *were ordained by* Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, *and* Petrus, *who were in that Council declared to be* Hereticks; *and* for 50. years together Taraſius *ſaith*, they had no other ordinations: *upon theſe evidences of the practice of the Church, this* Council *of* Nice *declared likewiſe, that* the ordi-

nation of Heretical Bishops was valid.

For the modern practice of the Church *of* Rome, *I appeal to the allowance therein given to the* Ordinations *of the* Greek Church, *although the* Greek Church *be charged with Heresie; and that ever since the notorious* Schism *in the time of* Michael Cerularius *A. D.* 1053. *In the time of* Innocent *the third some* Greek Clergy-men *living in the* Dioceses *of* Latin Bishops, *yet received ordination from* Greek Bishops, *which made the* Latin Bishops *suspend them from the execution of their Office, the* Pope, *hearing of it, sends to his Legat, wherein he consents to the suspension in case it were done without leave from the* Latin Bishop; *but if leave were obtained he takes off the suspension; because this* custom is allowed in the Church. *I need not produce more particular instances in this kind, which may be seen at large in* Morinus; *because in all the attempts of*

Extrav. de temp. Ordin. c. quod Transl. Morin. de sacris ordinat. part. 1. c. 3. 4. 5.

of reconciliation in the ſeveral Councils held to that purpoſe, as at Lyons, *and* Florence, *where all the matters in difference were moſt fully handled, there was never any objection made to the* Greek Ordinations. *But moſt remarkable to this purpoſe is the* Bull *of* Clement *the ſeventh containing in it a former* Bull *of* Leo *the tenth, publiſhed by* Leo Allatius, *by* Iſaacius Habertus, *and by* Morinus, *wherein their* Ordinations *and other rites and cuſtoms are expreſly allowed. And to this day ſaith* Morinus they are allowed in *Rome* not only to perform other parts of divine ſervice according to their cuſtoms in the Church of St. *Athanaſius*, but to ordain Prieſts after their own manner; *for which they had a* Bull *of* Urban *the eighth.*

Leo Allatius de ætat: Et interſt. in collat: Ordin. p. 5. 14. Iſaac. Habert. Pontifical. Græc. in præf. Morin. de Sacris Ordin. p. 1. c. 4.

And now I deſire T. G. *to conſider a little* his undeniable maxim, that no man can give to another that which he hath not himſelf, *whether he doth in earneſt think that his own*

Church

Church is ſo bereft of all common ſenſe, *as not to underſtand the force of this Maxim? and if it thought it of any weight in this matter, how it could ever approve the* Ordinations *of* Hereticks, *or decree that the* Sacraments *retain their efficacy, where the eſſentials of them are obſerved, whatever the faith or manners of the Inſtruments be?*

And this was all I intended in this Preface; of the reſt of his Book, the Reader may expect an account as God *gives health and opportunity.*

The

The Contents.

Preface to the two first Answers. p. 1.
A particular examination of the Pamphlet entitled Doct. Stillingfleet *against Doct.* Stillingfleet.
Of the insufficiency of J. W.*'s way of answering.* p. 13.
No contradiction about the charge of Idolatry. p. 18.
A distinct answer to his propositions. p. 26.
In what sense the Church of Rome *is owned by us as a true Church.* p. 29.
His Appendix about Idolatry considered. p. 34.
The second contradiction examined. p. 39.
The charge of Fanaticism defended. p. 50.
No contradiction in the charge of divisions p. 65.
The conclusion. p. 71.

An Answer to the Book entitled Doct. *Stillingfleets* Principles considered.

The occasion of annexing those principles. p. 75.
Of the notion of Infallibility. p. 79.
N. O*'s concessions.* p. 85.
His principles laid down. p. 95.
His exceptions answered. p. 98.
His proofs of Infallibility examined. p. 110.
Of the Arguments from Scripture for Infallibility. p. 116.
Of the argument from Tradition for it. p. 123.
Of the argument from parity of Reason. p. 137.
Of the Authority of the Guides of the Church in ten Propositions. p. 142.
The case of Vigilius *and* Honorius *at large discussed* p. 154, 159.

The

The different case of the separation of dissenters from our Church, and our separation from the Church of Rome. p. 180.
Of the means to attain the sense of Scripture without an infallible Guide. p. 186.
Of the necessity of a Judge in controversies. p. 191.
The way used in the Primitive Church for finding the sense of Scripture through several Ages of the Christian Church from the most authentick Writers of them. p. 198.
Church Authority not destroyed by my principles. p. 260.
What Authority we allow to Governors of the Church. p. 267.
The Roman Churches way of suppressing Sects compared with ours. p. 286.

ERRATA.

PAge 20. line 13. read the *Church*. p. 26. l. 14 for *and* r. *that*. p. 49. l. 2. for *here* r. *where*. p. 176. l. 23. r. *Eutychianism*. p. 177. l. 8. r. *followed*. p. 178. l. 5. r. *Patriarchal*. p. 182. l. 14. for *by* r. *be*. p. 189. l. 22. r. Apocalyptical. p. 209. l. 30. for *Boo* r. *Book*. p. 225. marg r. *Vales. not. ad Euseb*. p. 273. l. 11. r. *Euclid*. p. 271. l. 7. for *he makes this*, r. *this is made*. p. 280. l. 5. blot out one *the*.

The Preface.

WHen I Publiſhed the late *Book*, which hath ſo much enraged thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* againſt me, I thought I had reaſon to expect that a juſt Anſwer ſhould be made to it; but they have taken an effectual courſe to undeceive me; for by this *new way* I perceive, their utmoſt ambition is to have ſomething abroad which among themſelves may paſs for an *Anſwer*. Which put me in mind of what I have heard a great Perſon ſaid, when he had undertaken to manage an ill cauſe before a publick Audience, and one of his Friends asked him what he meant by it, *trouble not your ſelf*, ſaid he, *our own ſide will be ſure to believe me*. It was ſurely ſome ſuch preſumption as this, which made the learned Authors of theſe two elaborate *Pamphlets*

§. 1. Of the Nature of theſe Anſwers.

to appear in such a manner in Print, as if it were no great matter what they said, so their people might have this to say, and (if they can) believe it too, *that my book is answered.* If this be all their cause will afford, it deserves rather to be pitied than confuted; if it will bear more, they are as bad managers of it as their enemies could wish. For however I was threatned before hand that such answers were coming abroad, *every line of which would fetch blood*; yet, as cruel as they are when we are under their lash, I found that which they designed for my punishment to give me no small pleasure: and I never had so good an opinion of the mercifulness of their Church as when I saw with what feeble hands they chastised me. I had heard so much of their rage, that I expected their greatest strength would be employ'd upon me; and I could not tell what *Zamzummims* they might hitherto keep in the dark, whose arms were not to be made use of, but upon some special occasion when an Adversary was to be dispatch'd all at once and so perfectly subdued as never to appear more. While I was preparing my self for this kind of Martyrdome, out come these mighty men of valour, who have beaten nothing that I know of, but the air and themselves; for they have neither *tyed my tongue*, nor *broke my heart*, nor *fetched*

one

one drop of blood that I can yet find; all which were things I was told would be done, when theſe anſwers came abroad; which threatnings made ſo loud a noiſe, that I heard the report of them not only nearer home, but from very diſtant perſons and places.

§. 2. Of their common way of Anſwering our Books.

But leſt I ſhould be thought only to deſpiſe my Adverſaries (which I confeſs they have given me no ſmall occaſion to do) I ſhall beſtow a particular examination upon what they have offered by way of Anſwer to my Book. Only I think it reaſonable in the firſt place to take notice of their preſent way and method of Anſwering, wherein they make uſe of as many artifices, as they do in gaining Proſelytes. When we ſet our ſelves to Anſwer their Books, we endeavour to ſtate the Controverſie plainly, to examine their proofs, to apply diſtinct Anſwers to their Arguments fairly repreſented in their own words, and to render the whole Diſcourſe as clear and perſpicuous as may be, that all perſons may be capable of judging on which ſide the greateſt ſtrength and evidence lyes. This is the mighty advantage which a good cauſe gives us; we make uſe of no tricks to deceive men, nor Sophiſtical cavils to confound and perplex things; we dare appeal to the judgement of any impartial perſon, who will take the pains to examin the mat-

ters in difference between us. But in their late dealings with us, they ſeek to avoid the main things in diſpute, and abhor any methodical proceeding; one man picks out a ſentence here and there to anſwer, another a page or two together, a third leaps from one thing to another, as if reſolv'd to paſs by the greateſt difficulties; but he is a man of courage indeed, that dares fall upon the reer, and begin to confute a Book at the end of it, ſo that if he lives long enough, and get heart, he may in time come to the beginning: And if we obſerve them all, they look for nothing ſo much as ſome cleanly way of eſcape, and if they can but raiſe ſuch a duſt as to fly away without being openly diſcerned to do ſo, this they hope thoſe of their own ſide will be ſo kind and partial as to call a Victory. Theſe are no general accuſations, but ſuch as are eaſie to obſerve in their dealings with me as to my former Book, and that lately publiſhed. But to judicious men, all theſe little arts and ſhifts are either plain acknowledgements of a baffled Cauſe, or an Argument of a weak and unskilful management.

§. 3. Of their Calumnies againſt me.

If the Book it ſelf be a little too troubleſome to be medled with, it is beſt to fall upon the Author, and it is a hard caſe if by falſe and ridiculous ſtories, or open calumnies,

nies, or at leaſt baſe and ugly inſinuations, they cannot diminiſh his reputation; and then they hope the Book will ſink with its Author. But *we are not Ignorant* whoſe cauſe is wont to be managed by ſuch *devices* as theſe are, and from whom they have learnt this method of confuting Adverſaries. As for all their *railing accuſations* againſt me; I ſhall not ſo much as deſire God *to rebuke them*, but only pray that he would pardon them; and if I muſt thank them for any thing, it is for giving me the occaſion for exerciſing ſo great a charity. I have learnt of him *who when he was reviled, reviled not again*, not only to forbear reproaching them in the ſame manner, but to return them *good for evil*, and to pray for them while they calumniate me. I have ſo much the leſs reaſon to wonder that my Book ſhould be charged by them with no leſs than *Blaſphemy*, ſince the Mat. 26. 65. Author of our Religion himſelf was ſo, and ſuffered under that accuſation. But wherein I pray doth this *blaſphemy* lye? have I uttered any thing that tends to the reproach of *God* or true *Religion*? have I the leaſt word which malice it ſelf can ſtretch to the diſhonour of *Jeſus Chriſt*, the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*, or the *Holy Scriptures* written by divine Inſpiration? no; I challenge the boldeſt of them, and moſt malicious, to produce any thing I ever ſaid

or writ that doth but ſeem to look that way. Have I made the practice of true devotion ridiculous, and the real expreſſions of piety the ſubject of ſcorn and deriſion? No, ſo far from it, that it was only a juſt zeal for the Honour and practiſe of true Religion made me willing to lay open the ridiculous *Fanaticiſms* of ſome pretended *Saints* in the Roman Church. And muſt they be allowed to charge *Fanaticiſm* on us, and think it far from *Blaſphemy* to repreſent the *Enthuſiaſtick* Follies of the *Sectaries* among us; and when they are guilty of the very ſame, or greater, may not we ſhew their unjuſtice and partiality, without being accuſed of *Blaſphemy? But ſome of theſe are Canonized Saints*, as S. *Brigitt*, S. *Catharine*, S. *Francis*, and S. *Ignatius*; which is ſo far from making the Cauſe of their Church better, that to my underſtanding it makes it much worſe. For although *Fanaticiſm* be *diſowned* by our *Church*, it ſeems it is not barely countenanced and allowed in the *Church* of *Rome*, but *Canonized* and *adored*. That which I inſiſt upon, is this; either we have no *Fanaticks*, or theirs are ſo; for by the very ſame rule that ours are ſo, theirs muſt be too; for our *Fanaticks* do pretend as high to the *Spirit* and *divine Revelation* as any of theirs; only there is this remarkable difference between

between their *Fanaticks* and ours, that ours are *among us* but not *of us*, but theirs are both. Now if any one who pretends to *Inſpiration* and *Enthuſiaſm* cannot be charged with *Fanaticiſm* without *blaſphemy*, we muſt be expoſed to all follies and contradictions imaginable; and to what purpoſe are we bid to *try the Spirits whether they be of God or no, i. e.* whether their pretence to divine revelation be true or falſe? If there may be falſe pretences to *Inſpiration*, we are to examine the grounds of them, and to judge accordingly; and all falſe pretenders to *Inſpiration*, let them be *Canonized* by whom they will, are the higheſt ſort of *Fanaticks*; and the greater honour is given them, the greater diſhonour it is to the *Chriſtian Religion*. 1 Joh. 4. 1.

§. 4. Expoſing Fanaticiſm no diſſervice to Chriſtianity.

But theſe things ſhall be more largely diſcuſſed in their proper place: I now only take notice of the injuſtice of their calumny with which they have made ſo much noiſe among injudicious people: and I ſhould not have been ſo much concerned about it, had I not found ſuggeſtions to the ſame purpoſe in the Authors of the two Pamphlets. The one of them very kindly makes no difference *between* Lucian, Porphyrius *and me*, but only *ſome intereſt which doth byaſs me another way*; and *verily believes*, good man, *that were it not for that, I could flurt with as much piquancy and*

Dr. *Stillingfleet* againſt Dr. *Stillingfleet*. p. 11.

and railery at Christian Religion, as I do at the Roman. In which base suggestion there is no colour of truth, but only that he very honestly distinguisheth the *Christian*, Religion and the *Roman* from each other; as indeed they are in many things as different from each other as truth from falshood, wisdom from folly, and true piety from gross Superstition. If he had called me an *Atheist* in plain terms, the grosness of the calumny might have abated the force of it; but there is no such way to do a man mischief, as by sly insinuations and shrewd suggestions introduced with *I verily believe*, and expressed with some gravity and zeal. But you who are so good at resolving faith, what is this *verily believe* of yours founded upon? Have you the authority of your *Church* for it? have you any evidence of reason? or rather, have you it by some *vision* or *revelation* made by some of those *Saints*, whose *Fanaticism* is exposed? or do you *verily believe it*, as you *verily believe* many other things, for no reason in the world? If I should tell you I have made it my business to assert the truth of the *Scriptures*, and *Christian Religion* therein contained, in a large Discourse several years since published; such is your charity, that you would tell me, so did *Vaninus* write for *Providence*, when he denyed a *Deity*. If I should make large *Apologies* for

for my innocency, and publiſh a confeſſion of my faith, with proteſtations that no *intereſt* in the world could remove me from it; you might tell me, where there is no guilt what need ſo much ado? In plain terms, I know but one way to ſatisfie ſuch as you are, but I will keep from it as long as I can, and that is to go to *Rome* and be burnt for my faith; for that is the kindneſs there ſhewed to thoſe who contend for the purity of the *Chriſtian Religion* againſt the corruptions of the *Roman*. But ſuch calumnies as theſe, as they are not fit to be paſſed by, ſo are they too groſs to need any further anſwer. I ſhall however declare my mind freely to you; if I had no other notion of the Chriſtian doctrine, than what I have from the Doctrines of your Church as contrary to ours; no other meaſures of *Chriſtian* piety than from your myſtical *Theology*; no better way to Worſhip *God* than what is practiſed among you; no greater certainty of *Inſpiration* from *God* than of the *Viſions* and *Revelations* of your late *Saints*; no other *miracles* to confirm the *Chriſtian* doctrine than what are wrought by your *Images* and *Saints*, I ſhould ſooner chooſe to be a *Philoſopher*, than a *Chriſtian* upon thoſe terms. And *I verily believe* (to anſwer yours with another) that the frauds and impoſtures of the Roman

man Church have made more *Atheists* in *Christendom*, than any one cause whatsoever besides: for when men resolve all their faith into the testimony of a *Church* whose frauds are so manifest, and confessed by your best Writers, such as *Melchior Canus*, and *Ludov. Vives*; what can they who know no better, but suspect the *Inspirations* and *Miracles* of former Ages, who see such false pretences to them so much magnified, and the *Fanatick* pretenders *Canonized* on that account? And I am so far from thinking it any disservice to the Christian Religion to expose these *Fanaticisms*, that I again *verily believe* that *Christianity* will never obtain as it ought to do among men, till all those hypocritical cheats be yet more laid open to the view of the World; which if any one have but the courage and patience to undertake, it would be as great, and a much more useful labour than the cleansing of the *Augean Stable*. This is not *to make sport and recreation for the Atheist and debauched*, nor to give occasion to such persons *to turn the Inspirations of Holy Scripture into matter of Drollery and Buffonry*, as the author of the *second Pamphlet* tragically declaims; any more than our *Saviours* unmasking the hypocrisie of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* was the destroying the *Law* of *Moses*; or the discovery

Melch. Can. loc. Theol. l. 11. p. 534. Lud. Viv. de trad. disc. l. 5.

Dr. Stillingfleet's Princip. consid. Preface.

discovery of cheats and impostors doth give occasion to suspect the honesty of all mankind: Nay so far is it from that, that we think the separating of *Fanaticism* from true inspiration to be one of the best Services that can be done to the *Christian Religion*, which otherwise is in danger of being despised or rejected by the considerate part of mankind. But I would fain know of these men, whether they do in earnest make no difference between the Writings of such as Mother *Juliana* and the Books of *Scripture*; between the Revelations of S. *Brigitt*, S. *Catharine*, *&c.* and those of the *Prophets*; between the actions of S. *Francis* and *Ignatius Loyola* and those of the *Apostles*? if they do not, I know who they are that expose our *Religion* to purpose; if they do make a difference, how can the representing their visions and practices reflect dishonour upon the other, so infinitely above them, so much more certainly conveyed down to us with the consent of the whole Christian World? Thus much may here suffice to represent the arts our *Adversaries* are driven to, to defend themselves; I cannot blame them that they would engage *Religion* on their side, but so have all *Fanaticks* in the World as well as they; and I cannot for my heart see, but this

this heavy charge of *Blaſphemy* and under-mining Religion does as juſtly lye on them, who deride the *Fanaticks* among us, as on thoſe who have diſcovered the *Fanaticiſm* of the *Church* of *Rome*.

AN

AN EXAMINATION OF THE PAMPHLET,

Entituled,

Dr. *Stillingfleet* againſt Dr. *Stillingfleet.*

§. 1. The inſufficiency of his way of Anſwering.

HAving thus far laid open their preſent way of dealing with their *Adverſaries*, I now come to a particular conſideration of theſe two *Pamphlets*; and begin with that called Dr. *Stillingfleet* againſt Dr. *Stillingfleet, &c.* The Author of which is to be commended for ſo noble an enterpriſe (which few of the *Champions* of former Ages could accompliſh) *viz.* to make his Adverſary fall by his own ſword. But the miſchief of it is, theſe *Romantick Knights* do hurt no where but in Paper and their

their own imagination. But I forget his
P. 14. grave admonition, *that I would treat these matters seriously, and lay aside drollery.* To be then as grave as he can desire, there are these two things which I design to prove against him. 1. That on supposition I did contradict my self, in the way he insists upon it, that were no sufficient answer to my Book. 2. That I am far enough from contradicting my self in any one of the things which he insists upon.

1. Supposing what he contends for were true, yet my Book remains unanswered; the design of which was to shew that no man can joyn in the Communion of the *Roman Church* without great hazard of his salvation. If I had any where said the contrary, this indeed would have made it evident that I had contradicted my self. But what then? doth the force of all the arguments used by me in this last Discourse fall to the ground, because I was formerly of another opinion? Let me ask these revolters from the *Church* of *England* one question; whether they do not now more plainly contradict themselves as to their former opinions, than they can pretend that I have ever done? I desire to know, whether this makes all their present arguments for the *Roman Church* of no force? If they think their present reasons ought to be answered,

what-

whatever contrary opinion they had before; why, on ſuppoſition I had contradicted in a former Book what I ſay in this, muſt this render all that I have ſaid, or can hereafter ſay in this matter, invalid? Doth the ſtrength of all lye upon my bare affirming or denying? was it ever *true* becauſe I ſaid it? if not, how comes it to be *untrue* now, becauſe I deny it? I do not remember I was ever ſo vain, to make uſe of my own authority to prove a thing to be true, becauſe I believed it; and if I had, the world is not ſo vain to believe a man one jot the ſooner for it. If my authority in ſaying or denying be of no importance to the truth of the thing, then he may prove that I contradict my ſelf, and yet all the arguments of my Book be as ſtrong as ever. I do not deſire any one to follow my opinion becauſe it is mine, but I offer reaſon and authority for the proof of what I ſay; if thoſe be good in themſelves, they do not therefore ceaſe to be ſo, becauſe they are, or ſeem to he inconſiſtent with what I have ſaid elſewhere. So that ſelf-contradiction being proved, overthrows not the reaſon of the thing, but the authority of the perſon; and where things depend meerly upon authority, it is a good argument, and no where elſe. If a *witneſs* in a *Court* contradicts himſelf, his teſtimony ſignifies nothing; becauſe there is nothing elſe but his authority that makes his

teſtimony valid; but if a *Lawyer* at the *Bar* chance to ſpeak inconſiſtently, if afterwards he ſpeaks plain and evident reaſon, does that take off the force of it, becauſe he ſaid ſomething before which contradicted that plain reaſon? If the *Pope*, or thoſe who pretend to be infallible, contradict themſelves, that ſufficiently overthrows their pretence of infallibility; for he that changeth his mind, muſt be deceived once; but for us fallible mortals, if we once hit upon reaſon and truth, and manage the evidence of it clearly, that reaſon doth not loſe its former evidence, becauſe the ſame perſons may afterwards oppoſe it. Suppoſe I ſhould be able to prove that *Bellarmine* in his *Recognitions* contradicts what he had ſaid in his former Books; doth this preſently make all his arguments uſeleſs, and him uncapable of ever appearing in controverſie more? Doth this make all his authorities falſe and his reaſons unconcluding? doth it hence follow that he ſpake no where conſiſtently, becauſe once or twice, or perhaps as often as his neighbours, he contradicted himſelf? But my grave *Adverſary*, *I. W.* imagines that we Writers of Controverſies are like *Witneſſes* in *Chancery*, and are bound to make *Affidavits* before the *Maſters* of this *Court* of *Controverſie*; and that whatever we ſay is to be taken as upon our oath; this indeed would be an excellent way of bringing Controverſies

troverſies to an iſſue, if we were to be ſworn whether ſuch a thing as *Tranſubſtantiation* were true or falſe; and I cannot tell whether this, or laying wagers, or the *Popes* infallibility be the beſt way to end ſuch Controverſies; for any one of them would do it, if people could but agree about it. But now my *Adverſary* ſays, that if a man once contradict himſelf he is to be looked on as *a perjured perſon*, and whatever he ſaith, his word is not to be taken. This he not only begins with, but very triumphantly concludes with it in theſe words, *and this alone may ſuffice to annul whatever he has hitherto, or ſhall hereafter object againſt us; for a witneſs, who has been once palpably convinced to have forſworn or contradicted himſelf in matters of moment, beſides the condign puniſhment he is lyable unto, he does vacate all evidences produced by him, againſt his Adverſary, and deſerves never more to be heard againſt him in any Tribunal.* St. againſt St. p. 14.

I ſee now what it is they would be at, no leſs than perpetual ſilence and being ſet in the *Pillory* with that *Pamphlet* on my forehead *Dr. Still. againſt Dr. Still.* for being guilty of contradicting my ſelf, would ſatisfie *J. W.* and his Friends; This I ſuppoſe was the meaning of *ſtopping my mouth for ever*, when this Anſwer was to come out. But now I perceive it is ſo dangerous a thing, I had beſt

ſtand upon my defence, and utterly deny that I have contradicted my ſelf in any thing, in which *I. W.* hath charged me.

§. 2. 2. To make it then out that this is a groundleſs charge, I muſt go through the ſeveral particulars inſiſted on.

No contradiction about the charge of Idolatry. The *firſt* is in the *charge of Idolatry*; but how do I contradict my ſelf about this? had I vindicated the *Church* of *Rome* from *Idolatry* in my *Defence* of *Arch-biſhop Laud*, this had been indeed to contradict my ſelf: but this is not ſo much as pretended; and if it were, nothing could be more eaſily confuted; for in that very Book, as it falls out very happily, there is a diſcourſe to the ſame purpoſe, proving the *Church* of *Rome* guilty of *Idolatry*, in *Invocation of Saints* and *the worſhip of Images*, and that the *Heathen*, in the worſhip of inferiour *Deities* and *Images*, might be excuſed on the ſame grounds that thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* do excuſe themſelves. Here is then no appearance of a contradiction in terms; and it is only pretended to be by conſequence, *viz.* from yielding *that the Church of* Rome *and we do not differ in Fundamental points, and that the Church of* Rome *is therefore a true Church*; *from whence he inferrs, that it cannot be guilty of Idolatry: becauſe to teach that, would be a Fundamental error, and inconſiſtent with the Being of a true*

Rational Account. p. 596, 606.

a true Church: and therefore to charge the Church of Rome *with Idolatry, and to allow it to be a true Church is a contradiction.* This is the ſubſtance of what he ſaith upon this head: to which I ſhall anſwer by ſhewing, 1. That this way of anſwering is very diſingenuous. 2. That it is Sophiſtical, and proves not the thing which he intends.

1. That it is a diſingenuous way; becauſe he barely oppoſes a *judgement* of *charity* concerning their *Church*, to a *judgement* of *reaſon* concerning the *nature* of *actions*, without at all examining the force of thoſe reaſons which are produced in the *Book* he pretends to anſwer. Can *I. W.* imagine, that any one who enquires into the ſafeſt way for his ſalvation, and hears the *Church* of *Rome* charged with *Idolatry* in her worſhip, by arguments drawn from the plain *Law* of *God*, the common ſenſe of mankind, the repugnancy of their way of worſhip to the conceptions we ought to have of the divine nature, the conſent of the ancient Chriſtian Church, the parity of the caſe in many reſpects with the Heathen Idolaters, ſhould preſently conclude, that all theſe arguments are of no force, meerly becauſe the perſon who made uſe of them, had upon another occaſion judged ſo *charitably* of that *Church*, as to ſuppoſe it ſtill to retain the *eſſentials* of a *true Church*? I will put a caſe

parallel to this; ſuppoſe one of the *Church* of *Judah* ſhould have call'd the *Church* of *Iſrael* in the time of *Jeroboam* a *true Church*, becauſe they acknowledged the true *God*, and did believe an agreement in that common acknowledgement to be ſufficient to preſerve the *eſſentials* of a *Church* among them; and afterwards the ſame perſon ſhould go about to convince the *ten Tribes* of their *Idolatry* in worſhipping *God*, by the *Calves of Dan and Bethel*: would this be thought a ſufficient way of anſwering him, to ſay, that *he contradicted himſelf, by granting them a true Church and yet charging them with Idolatry?* whereas the only true conſequence would be, that he thought ſome kind of *Idolatry* conſiſtent with the Being of a *Church*. Might not ſuch a perſon juſtly ſay, that they made a very ill uſe of his *charity*, when he ſuppoſed only that kind of *Idolatry* which implyes more Gods than one, to *unchurch* a people; but however, thoſe perſons were more concerned to vindicate themſelves from *Idolatry* of any kind, than he was to defend his charitable opinion of them; and if they could prove to him, that this inferiour ſort of Idolatry does *unchurch* them as well as the groſſer, the conſequence of it would be that his *charity* muſt be ſo much the leſs, but their danger would be the ſame. This is juſt our caſe with the *Church* of

Rome;

Rome; we acknowledge that they ſtill retain the Fundamental articles of the *Chriſtian* faith, that there is no diſpute between them and us about the true *God* and his Son *Jeſus Chriſt*, as to his death, reſurrection, glory, and being the proper object of divine worſhip; we yield that they have true *Baptiſm* among them, in the name of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*; and we looking upon theſe as the *eſſentials* of a *true Church*, do upon that account own that Church to be ſo: but then we charge the *Roman Church*, with groſs corrupting that Worſhip which is proper to the divine nature, by her *worſhip of Images*, *adoration of the Hoſt*, and *Invocation of Saints*; which being done, not in expreſs terms againſt the worſhip of the true God, but by conſequence, we do not think this doth deſtroy the *Being* of a *Church* among them; although it makes the ſalvation of perſons in her communion extreamly hazardous: and after we have gone about to prove this by many and weighty arguments, is it reaſonable for any one to tell us that we contradict our ſelves, and therefore our arguments do ſignifie nothing? whereas in truth, here is no appearance of a contradiction to that which is our own ſenſe in this matter. For what ſhadow of a contradiction is it, to ſay, that the *Roman Church* is a *true Church*, and yet is guilty of *Idolatry*;

ſuppoſing that we believe ſome ſort of *Idolatry* which is very ſinful, not to be yet of ſo high a nature as to *unchurch* thoſe who practiſe it; And we chooſe the Inſtance of the *ten Tribes* for the ground of this charity. If they can prove that all ſorts of *Idolatry* do neceſſarily deſtroy the *eſſentials* of a *Church*, the conſequence is, we muſt have leſs charity for them, than we had before; And ſuch a conceſſion from us doth not ſhew their guilt to be leſs, but only our charity to be greater. Suppoſe a man ſhould exceed in his charity towards a perſon guilty of ſome grievous faults, and ſay, he believes he may be a pious man for all this; but withall ſeverely reproves him for his faults, and tells him the danger he continually runs by ſuch actions; would it be fair for ſuch a man to anſwer him, that his reproofs were not to be regarded, becauſe he contradicted himſelf, for he told him he believed him to be a pious man, and yet upbraided him with thoſe faults which were inconſiſtent with piety? what would the conſequence of this be to the thing it ſelf? would this make thoſe faults ever the leſs, becauſe he judged ſo charitably of the perſon notwithſtanding his committing them? But when we allow the *Church* of *Rome* to be *a true Church*, we are far from underſtanding by that a *ſound* or a *good* Church free from corruptions, which would be

the

the moſt proper ſenſe to found a contradiction upon, in this matter of *Idolatry*; but we mean no more by it, than as a man is a *true man* though he hath the *plague* upon him; thoſe which we account the *eſſentials* of a *Church* we deny not to it, but withall, we contend that it is over-run with ſuch corruptions in worſhip, as do mightily endanger the ſalvation of thoſe who live in the communion of it.

§. 2. The Sophiſtical cavils in this argument.

2. Having thus diſcovered the *diſingenuity* of making ſo bad a uſe of our *charity* againſt us, I now come to ſhew how *Sophiſtical* this way of anſwering is, by a cloſer examination of it.

Firſt, The ſtarting of a new objection anſwers no argument, and all that this amounts to is only raiſing a new difficulty; whereas he ought in the firſt place to have anſwered all the arguments I had brought to prove them guilty of Idolatry; and when he had done this fairly and plainly (which for ſome good reaſons he had no mind to do) he might then have inſiſted on the inconſiſtency of it with principles owned by me; but to do this without giving an anſwer, ſo much as to any one argument, is a clear evidence of a ſophiſtical and cavilling humour, rather than of any intention to ſatisfie an inquiſitive mind.

2. The force of this objection lyes in the different ſenſe and meaning of ſeveral expreſſi-

ons

ons made uſe of by him, which being explained, the objection will ſignifie nothing. For if we rightly underſtand the notion of Idolatry, the manner of teaching it, the ſenſe of Fundamental errours and a true Church, as it is owned by me, the very appearance of any contradiction vaniſheth.

I agree in the general, that *the true notion of Idolatry is, giving the honour due only to God to a meer creature*; and I deſire no greater advantage againſt the *Church* of *Rome*, than from ſuch a conceſſion; but then we are to underſtand, that this may be done ſeveral ways. 1. When the worſhip proper to the *true God* is given to a *falſe* God. 2. When the true *God* is acknowledged and worſhipped, but the *unity* of the *God-head* is denyed, and many *falſe Gods* are joyned with him in the ſame worſhip. In theſe two ſorts of *Idolatry*, I acknowledge that the *true God* is rejected, either wholly in the firſt way, or by conſequence in the ſecond. But withall I ſay, that the giving the Worſhip to a creature which is due only to *God* may be conſiſtent with the acknowledgement of one *Supream God*, and that theſe ways. 1. When one *Supream God* is acknowledged, but no difference is put between the external Worſhip of him and creatures. This was the *Idolatry* of the wiſer *Heathen*, who did in their conſciences

acknowledge

acknowledge that there was but one true and ſupream *God*, but yet gave the ſame worſhip to inferiour *Deities*, that they did to him. Theſe men might have pleaded for themſelves, for all that I know, as much to their advantage, as thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome* do againſt me. 2. When the worſhip proper to the true God is given to an Image: or the ſuppoſing of *God* to be truly honoured by us, by proſtrating our ſelves before any corporeal repreſentation of him. This likewiſe the Heathen were guilty of. St. *Paul* hath long ſince told us of ſome, *who profeſs that they know God, but in works they deny him*; ſo there may be ſome who may profeſs a worſhip *due only to God*, but in their actions may contradict it. As ſuppoſe a company of rebellious men, ſhould declare over and over that they acknowledge but *one Soveraign Power* of this Nation, inveſted in the perſon of the *King*; but yet, ſhould take upon themſelves to raiſe forces, to appoint great Officers of State, and require that the very ſame outward reverence and honour be given to them, which is given to the *King* himſelf; would any man in his ſenſes ſay, that becauſe theſe men ſtill declared the ſupream Authority to be in the King, that there was no *Treaſon* in ſuch actions? or that thoſe perſons contradicted themſelves, who allowed that

Tit. 1. 16.

their

their profeſſion was ſuch as became good ſubjects, but their actions made them guilty of *Treaſon.* The ſame we ſay of the *Church* of *Rome*; we confeſs they own the ſupream Power of the world to be in one *true God*, and we have no controverſie with them about the eſſential Doctrines of Religion (which is, that we mean by their being *a true Church*) but withal we ſay, they overthrow what they ſay in their own practice, they rob *God* of the honour due only to him, by giving it to *Angels*, and *Saints*, and *Images* and other creatures. And what contradiction now is there in all this, and a *Church* agreeing with us in the object of worſhip in general, ſhould act contrary to its own profeſſion, by requiring thoſe things to be done, which take away from *God* that honour which is due only to him, and giving it to creatures? And this, if I underſtand it, is all that this firſt contradiction in the charge of Idolatry doth amount to.

§. 3. A diſtinct anſwer to his propoſitions.

To appply this now to his own *propoſitions*, for the greater clearneſs and ſatisfaction of all indifferent perſons

His firſt Propoſition I agree to, viz. *That 'tis an article of faith, and a Fundamental point of Religion, that the honour which is due only to God is not to be given to a meer creature.* But I deſire it may be taken notice of,

of, that this *propoſition* is *Sophiſtically* expreſſed; for although it be no diſpute between us, whether that *honour which is due only to God, may be given to a creature*, yet it is a very great one, and the foundation of the charge of Idolatry, *what that honour is which is due only to God:* and in caſe we can prove that they do give to meer Creatures any part of that *honour* which is *due to God*, it cannot at all excuſe them to ſay, *that they acknowledge it to be Idolatry to give that honour, which they ſuppoſe to be due only to God, to a meer creature.* This *propoſition* therefore, though in it ſelf true, is captiouſly ſet down, and with an intention only to deceive unwary readers, as will appear by the next propoſition.

2. *To teach Idolatry is to err againſt the formentioned article of faith and Fundamental point of Religion*; i. e. *to teach Idolatry, is to teach that the honour which is due only to God is to be given to a meer creature.* That this is to teach *Idolatry*, no one queſtions; but our queſtion is, Whether they who do not teach this *Propoſition*, may not teach men to do thoſe things, whereby the worſhip due only to *God* will be given to a meer creature? If he can prove, that they who do not in terms declare that they do not diſhonour *God* cannot diſhonour him; if he can demonſtrate,

demonſtrate, that thoſe who do not teach *that the honour which is due only to God is to be given to a creature*, cannot poſſibly by any actions of theirs rob him of that honour which is due to him: this will be much more to his purpoſe than any thing he hath yet ſaid. And this *propoſition*, if he had proceeded as he ought to have done, ſhould not have been a particular *affirmative* but an Univerſal *Negative*; For it is not enough to ſay, that *to teach Idolatry is to teach that the honour which is due only to God is to be given to a creature*, but that *No Church which doth not teach this can be guilty of Idolatry*; for his deſign being to clear the *Roman Church*, his *Propoſition* ought to be ſo framed that all particulars may be comprehended under it. But becauſe he may ſay, *his immediate intention was, not to clear their Church from Idolatry, but to accuſe me of a contradiction*, I proceed to the next Propoſition.

3. *A Church that does not err againſt any article of faith, nor againſt any Fundamental point of Religion, does not teach Idolatry*. This propoſition is likewiſe very *Sophiſtical* and *captious*; for by *article of faith and fundamental point of Religion* is either underſtood, *the main fundamental points of doctrine contained in the Apoſtles Creed*, and then I affirm, that a *Church* which doth own all the Fundamentals of doctrine,

ctrine, may be guilty of *Idolatry*, and teach those things, wherein it lyes; but if by *not erring againſt any article of faith*, be meant, *that a Church which doth not err at all in matters of Religion* cannot teach *Idolatry*, the Propoſition is *true*, but *impertinent*.

4. *That the Church of* Rome *doth teach Veneration of Images, adoration of the Hoſt, and Invocation of Saints*, is agreed on both ſides.

5. *That the Roman Church does not err againſt any article of faith or Fundamental point of Religion*; This being that conceſſion of ours, from whence all the force of his argument is taken, muſt be explained according to our own ſenſe of it, and not according to that which he puts upon it; which that it may be better underſtood, I ſhall both ſhew in what ſenſe this conceſſion is made by us, as to the *Church of Rome*, and of what force it is in this preſent debate.

§. 4. In what ſenſe the Church of *Rome* is owned by us as a true Church.

For the clearer underſtanding in what ſenſe it is made by us, we are to conſider the occaſion of the Controverſie about *Fundamentals* between us and the *Church of Rome*: which ought to be taken from that *Book* to which he referrs. There we find the occaſion of it to be, the *Romaniſts* contending that all points defined by the *Church* are *Fundamental*, or *neceſſary to ſalvation*, on the account of ſuch a *Definition*; upon this the controverſie about

Rational Account. p. 47.

about *Fundamentals* was managed againſt them, with a deſign to prove that all things defined by the *Church* of *Rome* are not *Fundamental*, or *neceſſary to be believed* by all perſons in order to their ſalvation, becauſe they were ſo defined. To this purpoſe I enquired. 1. What the grounds are, on which any thing doth become neceſſary to ſalvation? 2. Whether any thing whoſe matter is not neceſſary, and is not required by an abſolute command in *Scripture*, can by any means whatſoever afterwards become neceſſary? 3. Whether the *Church* hath power, by any propoſition or definition, to make anything become neceſſary to ſalvation, and to be believed as ſuch, which was not ſo before? For the *firſt*, I propoſed two things. 1. What things are neceſſary to the ſalvation of men as ſuch, or conſidered in their ſingle or private capacities? 2. What things are neceſſary to be owned in order to ſalvation by *Chriſtian Societies*, or as the bonds and conditions of *Eccleſiaſtical communion*? For the reſolving of this I laid down theſe three Propoſitions.

1. That the very being of a *Church*, doth ſuppoſe the neceſſity of what is required to be believed in order to ſalvation.

2. Whatever *Church* owns thoſe things, which are antecedently neceſſary to the *Being* of a *Church*, cannot ſo long ceaſe to be a true

true *Church*. And here I expreſly diſtinguiſhed between the *eſſentials* of a *Church*, and thoſe things which were required to the *Integrity* or ſoundneſs of it, among which latter I reckoned the *worſhip* of *God* in the way preſcribed by him.

3. That the Union of the *Catholick Church* depended upon the agreement of it in things antecedently neceſſary to its being. From hence I proceeded to ſhew, that nothing ought to be owned as neceſſary to Salvation by Chriſtian Societies, but ſuch things which by all thoſe Societies are acknowledged antecedently neceſſary to the *Being* of the *Catholick Church*. And here I diſtinguiſhed between *neceſſary articles of faith*, and *particular agreements for the Churches peace*. I did not therefore deny, but that it was in the power of particular Churches, to require a *Subſcription* to *articles of Religion*, oppoſite to the errours and abuſes which they reformed; but I denyed it to be in the power of any *Church* to make thoſe things neceſſary articles of faith, which were not ſo before. And here it was I ſhewed the moderation of the *Church* of *England* above that of *Rome*; in that our *Church* makes *no articles of faith*, but ſuch as have the teſtimony and approbation of the whole Chriſtian world of all Ages, and are acknowledged to be ſuch by *Rome* it ſelf:

but the Church of *Rome* impoſeth *new articles of faith*, to be believed as neceſſary to ſalvation; as appears by the *Bull* of *Pius* 4. This is my plain meaning, which half-witted men have ſtretched and abuſed to ſeveral ill purpoſes: but not to wander from my preſent ſubject, what is it that *I. W.* can hence infer to his purpoſe? *viz.* that from hence it follows that the *Church* of *Rome* does not erre *againſt any article of faith, or any point neceſſary to ſalvation*; which if it be only meant of thoſe *eſſential points of faith*, which I ſuppoſe antecedently neceſſary to the *Being* of a *Church*, I deny it not, but do not ſee of what uſe this conceſſion can be to them in the preſent debate: ſince in the following Diſcourſe I made the *ancient Creeds of the Catholick Church* the beſt meaſure of thoſe things, which were believed to be neceſſary to ſalvation: ſo that the force of the argument comes to this, whatſoever *Church* does embrace the ancient *Creeds* cannot be guilty of *Idolatry*; but the *Church* of *Rome* doth embrace all the ancient *Creeds* by my own conceſſion, therefore it is a contradiction for me to grant that they hold the *ancient Creeds*, and yet to charge them with *Idolatry*. And theſe matters being thus made plain, there is no great difficulty to anſwer, by denying the *major Propoſition*, and aſſerting that a *Church*

a *Church* which does own all the articles of faith which are contained in them, may yet teach and practiſe thoſe things, which take away from that worſhip which is proper only to God, and give it to meer creatures; as I have proved the Church of *Rome* doth in *the worſhip of Images, adoration of the Hoſt*, and *Invocation of Saints*. But to make this yet more plain, there are two things we conſider in a *Church*, the *eſſence*, and the *ſoundneſs* of it; as in a man, we conſider his *being* a man and his *health*: when we diſcourſe of his meer Being, we enquire into no more than thoſe things which make him a man, whether he be ſound or not: ſo in a *Church*, when we enquire into the *eſſentials* of it, we think it not neceſſary to go any farther than the doctrinal points of faith; the reaſon is, becauſe *Baptiſm* admits men into the *Church* upon the profeſſion of the true *faith* in the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghoſt*; and whatever is ſufficient to make a member of the *Church*, that is in it ſelf ſufficient, being embraced, to make a *Church*; but when we enquire farther into the *moral integrity*, or *ſoundneſs* of a *Church*, then we think our ſelves bound, not barely to know what is acknowledged and received, but how far it is ſo; and whether that *Church* which owns the Fundamentals of Chriſtian faith, doth not by groſs

and damnable errours corrupt the Worſhip of God, and debauch thoſe very Principles which they profeſs to own. And in this reſpect none of us ever ſaid, *That the Church of* Rome *did not err*; nay we do ſay and have manifeſtly proved, that ſhe hath erred againſt the Chriſtian faith, by introducing palpable errours in doctrine, and manifold Superſtitions and Idolatries in practice. From hence it plainly appears, that the conceſſion *I. W.* urges me with of the *Church* of *Rome* being *a true Church* ſignifies nothing, in the ſenſe by me intended, which contradicts the charge of *Idolatry*; unleſs they can prove that none who own the *Apoſtles Creed*, or their *Baptiſm*, can ſo long as they ſo do, teach Idolatry, or be guilty of giving the honour due only to God to meer creatures. Theſe things being thus explained, I hope the *Sophiſtry* of this way of arguing is made ſo evident, that no man of underſtanding, that reſolves not before hand what to believe, is capable of being deceived by it.

§. 5. His *Appendix* conſidered.

Before I come to the next contradiction charged upon me, I ſhall for the diverſion of the Reader, and the ſuitableneſs of the matter, take notice of his *Appendix*, wherein *I. W.* goes about ſo pleaſantly to prove me an Idolater, by a notable trick, which it ſeems came into his head a little too late, after he had finiſht

niſht this worthy Treatiſe. I ſhould have ſuſpected it had been intended only for a piece of *Drollery*, but that the man ſo ſeverely rebukes me for it, and withall talks of nothing leſs than *demonſtration* in the caſe. What? (thought I) is it come to this at laſt? and am I become an Idolater too, who was never apt to think my ſelf enclined ſo much as to ſuperſtition? but what can not the controverting Wit of man do, upon ſecond and ſerious thoughts? All the comfort I found left was towards the concluſion, wherein he confeſſes *that the ſame argument proves the Prophets, Evangeliſts and Holy Ghoſt himſelf to be Idolaters*; Nay then, I hoped there was no great harm to be feared in ſo good company; and by that conſideration armed my ſelf againſt this terrible aſſault. But at laſt as he made nearer approaches to me, I found no miſchief was like to come, but what I brought upon my ſelf; for he charged me with nothing but my own Artillery, and the train that was laid to blow me up was fetched from my own ſtores; only he had diſpoſed it in a way fitteſt for this deep deſign. But the beſt of it was, his plot went no farther than *my* Idolatry, and both lay only in *Imagination*. For there he makes the ſeat of my *Idolatry*, which he demonſtratively proves muſt be ſo by my own argument. I ſhall therefore conſider

Dr. St. againſt Dr. St. p. 21.

what that was, and with what great art he imploys it againſt me. Among other arguments to ſhew that the prohibition of worſhipping *Images* was not peculiar to the *Jews*, but of an unalterable nature, I inſiſted upon *Gods* declaring the unſuitableneſs of it to his own infinite and incomprehenſible nature, which could not be repreſented to men, but in a way which muſt be an infinite diſparagement to it. *To whom will ye liken God? or what likeneſs will ye compare to him? It is he that ſitteth upon the circle of the earth*, &c. and the reaſon given of the Law it ſelf was, becauſe *they ſaw no ſimilitude of God*; from hence I ſhewed, that the wiſeſt Nations and Perſons among the Heathen looked on the Worſhip of *God* by *Images*, as unſuitable to a Divine and Infinite Being, and that the *Goſpel* ſtill more diſcovered *Gods* Spiritual nature, and the agreeableneſs of Spiritual Worſhip to him; that the *Apoſtles* urged this Argument againſt the Heathen Idolatry; and the *Fathers* of the *Church* thought the reaſon of this Law did equally oblige us with the *Jews*; now by what art doth he from hence prove me neceſſarily to be an Idolater, as well as they of the *Church* of *Rome*, who Worſhip God by Images againſt the very words and reaſon of this Law? The argument is briefly ſummed up by himſelf thus: *Whoever Worſhips*

Roman Idolatry. p. 55. 2. edit.

Iſa. 40. 19, 22.

Deut. 4. 15, 16.

P. 20.

Worſhips God repreſented in a way far inferiour to his greatneſs is an Idolater; but whoſoever Worſhips God repreſented to him without the Beatifical viſion, either by words or by imaginations as well as Images, he Worſhips God in a way far inferiour to his greatneſs; ergo, *whoever worſhips God repreſented unto him without the Beatifical viſion is an Idolater: but* Dr. St. *Worſhips God without the Beatifical viſion* (no doubt of it) ergo, *Dr.* St. *is an Idolater:* there is no help for it. Nay, from hence he proves, *that I cannot ſo much as think of God without Idolatry my ſelf, nor Preach of him without provoking others to it.* O the inſuperable force of reaſon, and the dint of demonſtration! but the miſchief is, all this ſubtilty is uſed againſt the *Law-maker* and not againſt me. Did I not cite the words of *God* himſelf, who therefore did forbid the making any likeneſs of him, becauſe nothing could be like him? Is there no difference between having *imperfect conceptions* of *God* in our minds, and making *unworthy repreſentations* of him to our ſenſes, with a deſign to worſhip them? Why did not *God* as well forbid the one as he did the other? Were the *Iſraelites* then *in the Beatifical viſion?* were their conceptions of *God* ſuitable to his incomprehenſible nature? if not, why were they not forbidden as well

to think of *God* as to make any *Images* of him? Is *God* as much diſparaged by the neceſſary weakneſs of our underſtandings, as by voluntarily falſe and corporeal *Images* of him? Nay doth not *God* deſign to prevent the errour of our *Imaginations* by ſuch prohibitions as thoſe are? and thereby commands us to think worthily of him, and when we pray to him, to conſider him only as an Infinite Being in his Nature and Attributes? I do not know what *Imaginations* others have of *God*; it may be thoſe in the *Church* of *Rome* meaſure all by themſelves, and *God* by their *Images* of him, and thence conclude, that no men can think of *God*, but as they picture him, like an *Old man ſitting in Heaven*; but I aſſure them, I never had ſuch an *Imagination* of him, and if I had, ſhould think it very unworthy of him. I know no other conception of *God*, but of a Being infinitely perfect; and this is rather an intellectual apprehenſion, than a material imagination of him. I am aſſured that he is, by mighty and convincing arguments, but to bring him down to my *Imagination*, is to contradict the evidence that I have of his *Being*; for the ſame reaſons which convince me that he is, do likewiſe convince me that he is infinite in power, and wiſdom, and goodneſs. If I thought otherwiſe of him, I ſhould know no

reaſon

reaſon to give him the Worſhip of my mind and ſoul. Although my conceptions cannot reach his greatneſs, yet they do not confine it, nor willfully debaſe it; they do not bring him down to the meanneſs of a Corporeal Image. But becauſe we cannot think highly enough of *God*, muſt we therefore deviſe ways to expoſe him to contempt and ſcorn? And we cannot but deſpiſe a *Deity* to whom any Image can be like. But ſuch abſurd and ſilly arguments deſerve no farther confutation. *They* indeed may take more liberty, who write to thoſe who are bound not to judge of what is writ, but only to cry it up. As for us, who think it not fit to have our People in ſuch ſlavery, we dare not venture ſuch idle ſtuff among them.

§ 6. The ſecond contradiction Examined.

I come therefore to the ſecond contradiction he charges me with, which is, concerning the danger of ſalvation which they are lyable to who communicate with the *Roman Church*, when yet I acknowledge *that Church to be a true Church, and therefore to be a true way to ſalvation:* and withall *Arch B.* Laud, *whom I defend, doth grant a poſſibility of ſalvation to thoſe in the Church of* Rome. The force of this contradiction depending on theſe conceſſions, I ſhall, 1. Shew in what ſenſe they are granted by us. 2. Examin the ſtrength of the *propoſitions*

ons he draws from hence, towards the making this a contradiction.

1. Concerning *the Roman Church being a true Church:* The *Arch-biſhops* Adverſary having falſely charged him with granting the *Roman* Church to be *a right Church*, he complains of his injuſtice in it; and ſaith, *that it is a Church and a true Church he granted, but not a right Church; for Truth only imports the Being; right, perfection in conditions; thus a Thief is a true man, though not an upright man. So a corrupt Church may be true, as a Church is a company of men which profeſs the faith of Chriſt, and are baptized into his name; but it is not therefore a right Church either in Doctrine or Manners*; and again ſaith, *It is true in that ſenſe, as* ens *and* verum, *being and true, are convertible one with another; and every thing that hath a Being is truly that Being which it is in truth of ſubſtance.* The Replyer to him, ſaith, *that the notion of a Church implyes Integrity and Perfection of conditions*; upon which I gave him this Anſwer, That he did herein betray his weak or willful miſtakes of a Church *morally* for *Metaphyſically true.* If he could prove it impoſſible for a *Church* to retain its *Being* that hath any errours in doctrine, or corruptions in practice, he would therein do ſomething to the

Rational Account. P. 293.

P. 295.

the purpoſe; but when he had done it, all that he would get by it was, that then we ſhould not ſo much as acknowledge the *Roman Church* to be *Metaphyſically* a *true Church*; and therefore the Reader is left to judge, whether his Lordſhips Charity for, or his Teſtimony againſt their Church was built upon better grounds. By this it is evident in what ſenſe it was granted, that the *Roman Church* was a *true Church*.

2. *Concerning poſſibility of ſalvation in that Church*; To the queſtion that was asked my *Lord* of *Canterbury*, *whether a perſon might be ſaved in the Roman faith?* he gives this Anſwer, *that the Ignorant that could not diſcern the errours of that Church, ſo they held the Foundation and conformed themſelves to a Religious life might be ſaved*: and after explains himſelf more fully, *that* might be ſaved *grants but a poſſibility, no ſure or ſafe way of ſalvation; the poſſibility, I think*, ſaith he, *cannot be denyed to the Ignorants, eſpecially becauſe they hold the Foundation and cannot ſurvey the building. And the Foundation can deceive no man that reſts upon it: But a ſecure way they cannot go, that hold with ſuch corruptions when they know them.* And again, *Many Proteſtants indeed confeſs, there is ſalvation poſſible to be attained in the Roman Church; but yet they ſay withall, that*

Arch B. Lauds Conference. p. 280. P. 282. P. 285.

that the errours of that Church are ſo many, (and ſome ſo great, as weaken the Foundation) that it is very hard to go that way to Heaven, eſpecially to them that have had the truth manifeſted. P. 199. And in another place, *I do indeed for my part (leaving other men free to their own judgement) acknowledge a poſſibility of ſalvation in the Roman Church: but ſo as that which I grant to Romaniſts, is not as they are Romaniſts, but as they are Chriſtians, that is, as they believe the Creed, and hold the Foundation Chriſt himſelf, not as they aſſociate themſelves wittingly and knowingly to the groſs Superſtitions of the Roman Church. And I am willing to hope there are many among them, which keep within that Church, and yet wiſh the Superſtitions aboliſhed which they know, and which pray to God to forgive their errours in what they know not, and which hold the Foundation firm and live accordingly, and would have all things amended that are amiſs, were it in their power. And to ſuch I dare not deny a poſſibility of ſalvation, for that which is Chriſts in them, though they hazard themſelves extreamly, by keeping ſo cloſe to that which is Superſtition, and in the caſe of Images comes too near Idolatry.* Theſe are my *Lord of Canterburies* own words, and laid together in my *Defence* of him, which *J. W.* ought

Rational Account. p. 622.

ought to have repreſented, if he had deſigned any thing but *Sophiſtry* and trifling. But his game had been then quite ſpoiled; the fine ſport of making contradictions had been loſt, and his croſs purpoſes had come to nothing.

I now come to ſee what *contradictions* he wire-draws from hence by the help of his *Propoſitions*.

1. *Whoever is in a condition, wherein he is certainly ſaved, is in no danger or probabilty of being damned.* If by *he is certainly ſaved*, he ſpeaks of the *event*, then he were a hard hearted man that would not grant, that he that is actually ſaved *is in no danger or probability of being damned*; if he means it *of a certain way to ſalvation*, then it is yet capable of ſeveral meanings. For *to be in a certain way* may imply one of theſe three things. 1. That the way it ſelf is ſo plain that a man cannot miſs of it. 2. Or that the way is in it ſelf certain, but there are ſo many by-paths and turnings lying hard by it, that it is a very hard matter for any man to keep in it. 3. *To be in a certain way*, is, when not only the way it ſelf is certain, but a man keeps conſtantly in that way. According to theſe ſeveral ſenſes this Propoſition may be underſtood; if by it be meant. 1. *He that is in a certain way to ſalvation, is in no danger or probability*

probability of being damned, i. e. he that keeps constantly in that way which will certainly lead him to Heaven, the Proposition is true, but impertinent; but if by it be meant no more but this, *that he is in a way which in it self leads to Heaven, but there are so many cross and by-paths near it, that though it be possible for him to hit it, yet it is extreamly hazardous*, no one can imagine that such a one is in no probability of miscarrying, for we say he is in very great danger of it, notwithstanding the tendency of the way it self.

2. Prop. *Whoever lives and dyes in a true way to salvation, having conformed to its directions, or whoever has done all that was necessary to attain unto salvation is in a condition, wherein he is certainly saved.* The *Sophistry* of this is so palpable, that the weakest eye may discern it; for it supposes that *true way* to salvation wherein he lives to be a *very safe* and *secure way, i. e.* that it be not only true in it self, but free from such errours and corruptions which may endanger salvation; and in that sense it is *true*, but very far from the purpose. For none of us did ever yield that the *Roman Church* is a *safe way* to salvation; nay it is expresly denyed by my *Lord* of *Canterbury*, as well as by me. But here lyes still another piece of *Sophistry* to be taken notice of, *whoever hath done all that*

that was neceſſary to attain ſalvation, is in a condition wherein he is certainly ſaved; no doubt of it; but the doing all that is neceſſary to ſalvation is not bare believing the neceſſary articles of faith, contained in the Creed, but obeying the *Will* of *God*; which cannot be done by thoſe who wilfully adhere to groſs and open violations of it; as I have charged the *Church* of *Rome* to do, in her ſolemn acts of Worſhip. Their cauſe certainly is at a very low ebb when ſuch pittiful *Sophiſtry*, muſt paſs for reaſoning and demonſtration among them. Never men had more need of a *ſelf-evidencing cauſe*, as well as *propoſitions*, than they; ſo little help do they contribute to it by their Writings.

3 Prop. *The Roman Church is a true way to ſalvation, and teaches all that is neceſſary to attain unto it. This is granted*, he ſaith, *by me and other Proteſtants, when we acknowledge the Roman Church to be a true Church*; but in what ſenſe, I have already explained, ſo far as to leave no colour of arguing from hence to any contradiction in me. For this *true way to ſalvation* in our ſenſe is no more, but that the *Church* of *Rome* doth acknowledge ſo much of Chriſtian faith, as is ſufficient to ſave men, on condition they live accordingly, and do not by groſs corruptions in doctrine or practice render that faith ineffectual

to

to them: but withall we aſſert and maintain, that to theſe neceſſary articles of Chriſtian faith, the *Church* of *Rome* hath added ſuch errours and corruptions, as make the ſalvation of any perſon extreamly hazardous, who lives in the communion of it. And let them have all the comfort from hence which they can, I am ſure they have not this, that they have brought me to contradict my ſelf by ſuch conceſſions as theſe.

By this, his laſt Propoſition comes to nothing; *whoever lives and dyes in the communion of the Roman Church, having conformed to her doctrine, lives and dyes in a true way to ſalvation having conformed to its directions, and has done all that was neceſſary to attain to it.* Which evidently ſuppoſes that we yield that the doctrine of the *Roman Church*, is *a ſafe way* to ſalvation, which we utterly deny; all that we aſſert is, that ſo much of the common Principles of Chriſtianity, as is retained in the *Roman Church* is ſufficient for the ſalvation of thoſe, who do not wilfully corrupt them by bad opinions and practices, or if they have, do repent ſincerely. But for thoſe who conform themſelvs to the doctrine and directions of the *Roman Church* as ſuch, we are far from ever ſaying that *ſuch live and dye in a true way to ſalvation*; for this were to make thoſe doctrines and di-

directions to be as holy and innocent as we believe them to be falſe and pernicious. See now what a contradiction here is; for me to aſſert the *Church* of *Rome* to be *a true Church*, becauſe it retains the Fundamentals of Chriſtianity; and yet to make the condition of thoſe who live in it ſo hazardous in point of ſalvation, by reaſon of the groſs errours, which men are bound to believe as neceſſary points of faith; and horrible Superſtitions which they muſt conform to, if they follow her directions. Surely he could not but know this to be our meaning, and conſequently to have no ſhadow of contradiction in it, no more than is in this plain *Propoſition, That a poſſible way to ſalvation may yet be very dangerous.* But though *Jugglers* know their own cheats, they would loſe their trade if they made them known to the people. Something muſt be ſaid to amuſe *them*, and this ſeemed the prettieſt way, to confound them, by dazeling their eyes with ſuch appearances of contradictions: and thereby to perſwade their own party, that they need not fear the the attaque of ſuch an enemy who falls foul upon himſelf. But it is nothing but the miſt he caſts before their eyes, can make any have ſuch an imagination; it is but making things clear, and then nothing but order and agreement appears.

St. againſt *St.* p. 7. But yet he quarrels with me, for *making the caſe of living in willful ſin and in the corruptions of the Roman Church parallel with each other*; 1. *becauſe I will not grant that a willful ſin, ſuch as adultery, to be a true way to Heaven*; and doth he think that I ever imagined *Idolatry* and groſs ſuperſtition to be ſo; If I grant that in the *Church* of *Rome* they have a *true way to Heaven*, it is as other debauched Chriſtians have, who own faith enough to ſave them, but their deſtruction comes from not living agreeably to it. 2. *Becauſe I grant more to them than to Jews or Pagans, yet they may be ſaved if they do repent.* True, but they are not in ſo great likelyhood of *repenting*, as thoſe who own the Fundamental articles of the Chriſtian faith, and have a ſincere deſire in general to ſerve God according to his will; the Grace of God being more plentiful, where the Chriſtian faith is owned, than where it is rejected; upon which account *Jews* and *Heathens* are in more danger of not repenting, and conſequently of ſalvation than thoſe that live in the *Roman Church.* 3. *Becauſe I grant a greater capacity of ſalvation to Roman Catholicks than they do to Proteſtants; but they do not deny it to Proteſtants if they repent.* But the difference lyes in the nature and acts of the repentance required; We ſay a general repentance, and

and a vertuous ſincere mind, which deſires to know &do the will of God may be ſufficient, together with a particular repentance of all known miſcarriages; but they ſay ſuch a repentacne is neceſſary for us, as does imply a diſowning our *Church*, as ſuch wherein no ſalvation is to be had, and a joyning with the Communion of the *Church* of *Rome*: therefore the queſtion about their charity and ours, is about the poſſibility of the ſalvation of perſons living and dying in the *communion* of either *Church*; We ſay on the conditions before mentioned, men may be ſaved, though they do not in terms renounce their communion, but they ſay that none who do not return to their communion can be ſaved; and in this we juſtly charge them with horrible uncharitableneſs, when many of their Writers allow a greater poſſibility of ſalvation to meer Heathens. 4. *Becauſe Arch-biſhop* Laud *grants a greater capacity of ſalvation than other Proteſtants*; but in what ſenſe I have already ſhewed. 5. *That this is in effect to ſay, that it is a true way to Heaven if they go out of it.* Not if they go out of it ſo far as it is true, but ſo far only as it is falſe and dangerous. If a man were going the right way from *London* to *York*, as far as *Stamford*, and there went quite out of his way into the *Fens*, here his life is in danger; if I ſhould tell this man that the way

from *London* to *York* was *a certain way*, that the way he went in as far as *Stamford* was a *true way*, and if he had kept in it, would have brought him to *York*, but the *way* he is now in is very *dangerous*, and if he does not return, his life is in perpetual hazard; is this all one as if I ſhould tell him, *while you were in the true way, you muſt go out of it?* No ſuch ſenſe can be put upon ſuch words, by any man that hath ſenſe; and for others, we give them leave to cry *nonſenſe* and *contradiction.*

P. 8. All his other petty objections run upon the ſame palpable miſtake, and it would be but repeating the ſame thing to anſwer the other remaining cavils upon this Argument.

§. 7. The charge of Fanaticiſm defended. I come therefore to the ſore place indeed, the touching whereof hath made them to kick and wince ſo much at me; and that is the *Fanaticiſm* of the *Roman Church.* Which made them complain to *Cæſar*, that *it was a new crime, and never heard of before.* What? they; the ſober, the judicious, the wiſe people of the *Church* of *Rome* turned *Fanaticks!* it's falſe, it's impoſſible; nay, it is abſolutely and utterly impoſſible to be true; and none but *Atheiſts* can charge them with it. This hath been their common way of anſwering to this new charge; but not one wiſe word hath been ſaid in a juſt Vindication

of

of themſelves, by giving anſwer to thoſe many plain, and undenyable Inſtances I have produced. I wiſhed for no other tryal than to be bound to bring forth their own Authors, and to make good the Authorities I had cited, and my fidelity therein; but they have fairly declined this way of tryal. But how then can they free themſelves from this imputation? we have men of art to deal with, and it is ſome pleaſure to obſerve the skill they uſe in warding off a blow they did not look for. But if they have nothing more to ſay then *J. W.* can help them to, the charge will ſtick the faſter, for his attempt to clear them of it.

He begins with a deſcription of *Fanaticiſm, which*, he ſaith, *doth neceſſarily contain a reſiſtance of authority*; and for this, very unhappily quotes my own words. *By Fanaticiſm we underſtand either an Enthuſiaſtick way af Religion, or reſiſting authority under pretence of Religion*; juſt as if one ſhould ſay the true notion of *Idolatry* implyes the renouncing the true God, and to prove it ſhould quote words of mine to this purpoſe, That Idolatry is either renouncing the true God, or worſhipping the true God by an Image: for as in that caſe, it is evident, I make two ſorts of *Idolatry*; ſo it is as plain in this, that I make two branches of *Fanaticiſm*, whereof P. 8.

the one is, *an Enthuſiaſtick way of Religion*, the other *reſiſtance of authority under the pretence of Religion*. But if this be the true notion of *Fanaticiſm*, why doth he not ſpeak one word in vindication of them, from that very kind of *Fanaticiſm*, which I had charged them to be ſo deeply guilty of? Had I not proved by plain teſtimonies, that the moſt *Fanatick* principles of Rebellion were owned by the Jeſuitical party among them? viz. *the Kings deriving his power from the people*, and *the peoples authority to call the King to an account, and if they ſee good to take away his power and change the Government: and not only ſo but to take away his life too?* Had I not proved by clear and late Inſtances, that the party which owns theſe principles is to this day the moſt countenanced and encouraged at *Rome*? and any honeſt men among them, as to theſe principles, are on that account hated and perſecuted, as *R. W.* and his *Brethren*. But why no anſwer to this charge? Theſe are things they cannot deny, and yet dare not confeſs them to be true. If *J. W.* anſwer again, let him ſpeak out like a man, and either confeſs and deteſt theſe Principles, or we ſhall charge them farther with this worſt and moſt dangerous ſort of *Fanaticiſm*. My duty and juſt zeal for his *Majeſties* intereſt and ſecurity, will not ſuffer me to let

Fanaticiſm of Rom. Church. ſ. 16. p. 299. 2. ed.

go

go this part of the charge against them, although they would fain have it passed over in silence, as though never a word had been said concerning it. This is one of the best arts I have met with in this Pamphlet; for unwary Readers will not remember the charge, when they find no answer: but if *J. W.* had attempted to answer it, his shuffling and tricks might have made the deeper impression in the Readers minds. Remember then this charge stands good against them, without so much as their pretending to answer it.

To come now to the other part of *Fanaticism*, viz. *an Enthusiastick way of Religion:* and here to proceed clearly, I shall lay down the method of his *Defence*, and then examine it. The strength of his *Defence* lyes in these *Propositions.*

1. *That Fanaticism does necessarily contain a resistance against authority.*

2. *No particular ways of Religion, countenanced by a competent authority, are Fanaticism.*

3. *Those things which concern religious Orders and Method of Devotion, which I charge them with, are countenanced by a competent authority,* viz. *The Authority of that Church.*

4. *That Church cannot countenance Fanatism which obligeth all persons to submit to her judgement.*

So that here are two Principles by which *J. W.* thinks to vindicate their *Church* from *Fanaticiſm*; viz. *competent authority*, and *ſubmiſſion of judgement to the Church*. To ſhew the invalidity of this anſwer, I ſhall do theſe things.

1. Shew the inſufficiency of it.

2. The monſtrous abſurdities conſequent upon it.

1. If this anſwer were *ſufficient*, he muſt make it appear, that there have been none charged by me as *Fanaticks* in their *Church*, but ſuch as have ſubmitted themſelves and their judgement to the authority of their *Church*. For let us conſider the occaſion of this charge, and we ſhall preſently diſcern the inſufficiency of this way of anſwering it. The occaſion was, that my Adverſary made all the *Sects* and *Fanaticiſms* among us to be the effect of the *Reformation*; what anſwer could be more proper in this caſe, than to ſhew, that there were as wild and extravagant *Fanaticiſms* before, as have been ſince? which is a plain evidence *that* cannot be the cauſe of them, to which they imputed them. To make this out, I ſearched into the ſeveral ſorts of *Fanaticiſm*, and gave inſtances very clear of as great *Fanaticks* in the times before the reformation, as have been ſince: from the many pretenders to immediate Revelations among

among them, who were persons allowed and approved by their Church, and some of them *Canonized* for *Saints*; but besides these, I gave such other Instances of *Fanaticism* among the *Friers*, and others of their *Church*, as were never heard of in the world before; as the broachers and maintainers of the *Friers Gospel*, which was to put out of doors the *Gospel* of *Christ*; the *Spiritual Brethren* of the order of S. *Francis* called by several names, but especially that of *Fratricelli*, who continued long, spread far, and more disturbed the *Church* than any since have done, the *Dulciniſtæ* in *Italy*, the *Alumbrado's* in *Spain*, *&c.* What doth he now say concerning all these? were these countenanced by a *competent authority* among them? *did they submit their judgement to the Church?* if neither of these be pretended in reference to them, then this answer must be very insufficient, because it doth not reach to the matter in charge.

2. For those who were as he saith, *countenanced by authority, and did submit themselves to the Church*, yet this doth not clear them from *Fanaticism*; but draws after it these monstrous absurdities.

1. That prevailing *Fanaticism* ceases to be *Fanaticism*; like Treason, which when it prospers none dare call it Treason; an excellent way, this, to vindicate the *Fanaticism* of the

late

late times, which becauſe *countenanced* by an *authority*, ſuppoſed *competent* enough by ſome who then writ of *Obedience* and *Government*, it ceaſed to be *Fanaticiſm*; and all the wild and extravagant heats of mens brains, their *Enthuſiaſms* and *Revelations* were Regular and orderly things, becauſe *countenanced* by ſuch *Authority* as was then over them.

2. By this rule the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*, nay our *Lord* himſelf, were unavoidably *Fanaticks*; for what *competent authority* had they to countenance them? The *Jewiſh Church* was not yet caſt off while our *Saviour* lived, but utterly oppoſed his doctrine and Revelation, as coming from a private Spirit of his own; according therefore to theſe excellent Principles, *our B. Saviour* is made a meer *Fanatick*, becauſe he wanted a *competent Authority* of the *preſent Church* to *countenance* him; the ſame was generally the caſe of the *Prophets*, and of all the *Apoſtles*. But what rocks and Precipices will a bad cauſe drive men upon? If that which makes *Fanaticiſm* or not *Fanaticiſm*, be the being *countenanced* or *not countenanced* by this *competent Authority*, theſe horrible abſurdities are unavoidable; and all Religion muſt be reſolved into the will and pleaſure of this *competent Authority*. But I need not take ſuch pains to prove this, for my brave Anſwerer *J. W.* ſets it down in his own words.

words. *Moreover, otherwiſe all the particular manners of Preaching or Praying practiſed by the Prophets, and all their extraordinary viſions and revelations would be flat Fanaticiſm; but becauſe they were countenanced by a competent authority, they could not deſerve that character.* Excellent doctrine for a *Popiſh Leviathan!* are you in earneſt ſir? do you think the *Prophets* had been *Fanaticks*, in caſe of no *competent authority* to *countenance* them? What *competent authority* had the *Prophet Elijah* to *countenance* him, when all the *Authority* that then was, not only oppoſed him but ſought his life? What *competent Authority* had any of the *Prophets* who were ſent to the ten Tribes? what had *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, and the reſt of them? It ſeems then, all theſe excellent and inſpired perſons are caſt into the common herd of *Fanaticks*, for want of this *competent Authority* to *countenance* them. And yet this is the Man (meerly becauſe I lay open the *Fanaticiſm* of ſome their pretended *Saints*, ſuch as *Ignatius Loyola* and S. *Francis*) who ranks me with *Lucian* and *Porphyrie*: hath he not himſelf a great zeal for *Religion* the mean while, reſolving all revelation into his *competent authority*? and not only ſo, but paralleling *the expreſſions and practices of S.* Brigitt, *and Mother* Juliana, (than which ſcarce any thing was ever Printed more

St. againſt *St.* p. 9.

1 King 19. 18.

Rom. 11. 3.

D.

more ridiculous in the way of *Revelations*) *with thoſe of the holy Prophets and Apoſtles?* If a man deſigned to ſpeak miſchievouſly againſt the *Scriptures* and *Divine Revelation*, he could not do it more to purpoſe than *J. W.* hath done in theſe words: when he compares things whoſe folly is ſo manifeſt at the firſt view, with that divine Wiſdom, which Inſpired thoſe holy perſons, whom *God* ſent upon particular meſſages to his people, and gave ſo great aſſurance that he ſent them; and who delivered matters of great weight and moment, and not ſuch tittle tattle as thoſe two Womens Books are fraught withall. But if this be the way they have to vindicate them from being *Fanaticks*, it is abſolutely the worſt that could be thought of; for it cannot diſcover ſo high an opinion of them, as it doth a very mean one of the *Books* of *Scripture*, and the *Divine Revelations* therein contained. I could here earneſtly intreat the wiſer men of that *Church*, for the honour of *God*, and the *Chriſtian Religion*, not to ſuffer ſuch inconſiderate perſons to vindicate their cauſe, who to defend the extravagant infirmities of ſome *Enthuſiaſtical* women among them, are ſo forward to caſt dirt and reproach upon our common Religion, and thoſe Revelations from whence we derive it. But I forbear; only it is a ſhrewd ſign, if this way be allowed, of a

wretched

wretched cauſe, that cannot be maintained without plunging thoſe, who rely upon their word, into the depths of *Atheiſm*. But theſe are not things to be ſo ſlightly paſſed over, they deſerve a fuller and ſeverer chaſtiſement. For the preſent, this is enough to ſhew, what monſtrous abſurdities this way of vindicating their *Church* from *Fanaticiſm* hath brought *J. W.* to. Yet in one reſpect he deſerves ſome pardon, for they are wont to write their anſwers upon the common Themes out of ſome ſtaunch Authors, who conſidered a little better what they writ; But this was a new charge, and neither *Bellarmin*, *Becanus*, nor any of their old beaten ſouldiers, could give them any aſſiſtance; they found not the Title of the *Fanaticiſm* of the *Roman Church* in any of their *common-place-Books*; therefore plain Mother-wit muſt help them, and ſo it hath bravely. But before they again attempt this matter, I deſire them to conſider theſe things, leaſt they ſhould in a deſperate humour utterly give up the cauſe of *Religion*, finding themſelves unable to defend that of their *Church*.

1. Whether there can be any greater *Fanaticiſm*, than a falſe pretence to immediate divine Revelation? For what can more expoſe men to all the follies and deluſions imaginable, than this will do? what actions can be

ſo

ſo wild and extravagant but men may do, under ſuch a pretence of *immediate Revelation* from *God*? what bounds of order and Government can be preſerved? ſome may pretend a Revelation to take up Arms againſt their Prince, or to deſtroy all they meet (which is no unheard of thing) others may not go ſo far, but may have revelations of the unlawfulneſs of Kingly Government; others may pretend revelations of a *new Goſpel*, and a more *ſpiritual diſpenſation* than hath been yet in the World, as the *Mendicant Friers* did.

2. Whether we are bound to believe all ſuch who ſay, They have divine revelations? or whether perſons may not be deceived in thinking they have revelations, when they are only deluſions of their own Fancies or the Devil? if not; then every one is to be believed who pretends to theſe things, and then all follies and contradictions muſt be ſwallowed which men ſay they have by immediate revelation; and every *Fanatick* muſt be believed, to have divine revelation who believes himſelf, though he be only deluded by his own Imagination, or become *Enthuſiaſtical* by the power of a diſeaſe in his head, or ſome great heat in his blood.

3. Whether

3. Whether there muſt not be ſome *certain rules* eſtabliſhed whereby all perſons, and even *competent authority* it ſelf, muſt proceed in judging theſe pretences to revelation, whether they be true or falſe? for if they proceed without rule, they muſt either be inſpired too, or elſe, muſt receive all who pretend to divine revelations: if there be any certain rules, whereby the revelation is to be judged; then if any perſons receive any revelation againſt thoſe rules, whether are other perſons bound to follow their judgement againſt thoſe rules?

4. Whether there can be any more certain rule of judging, than that two things evidently contradictory to each other, cannot both come from divine revelation? For then God muſt contradict himſelf, which is impoſſible to be ſuppoſed, and would overthrow the faith of any divine revelation. And this is the plain caſe of the revelations made to two famous *Saints* in the *Roman Church*, S. *Brigitt* and S. *Catharine*; to one it was revealed, *that the B. Virgin was conceived with Original ſin*; to the other, *that ſhe was not*: both theſe have *competent Authority*, for they were both *Canonized* for *Saints* by the *Roman Church*, and their *Revelations* approved, and therefore (according to *J. W.*) neither of them were *Fanaticks*, though it is certain that

that one of their Revelations was falſe. For either God muſt contradict himſelf, or one of theſe muſt be deceived, or go about to deceive, and what greater *Fanaticiſm* can there be, than that is? if one of theſe had only ſome *Fanatick Enthuſiaſm*, and the other *divine Revelation*, then *competent authority* and *ſubmiſſion to the judgement of the Church*, is not a rule to judge *Fanaticiſm* by; for thoſe were equal in both of them.

5. Whether there be an equal reaſon to look for revelations now, as in the time of the *Prophets*, and our *Saviour*, and his *Apoſtles*? or whether God communicates revelations to no other end, but to pleaſe and gratifie ſome *Enthuſiaſtical* tempers? and what ſhould be the reaſon he ſhould do it more now, than in the age wherein revelations were more neceſſary? In thoſe times God revealed his mind to men, but it was for the benefit of others; when he ſent them upon particular meſſages, as the *Prophets*, or made known ſome future events to them of great importance to the Church, as the coming of the *Meſſias*, &c. or Inſpired them to deliver weighty doctrines to the world, as he did both the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*: why ſhould we think, that God now, when the revelations of theſe holy and inſpired perſons are upon record, and all things neceſſary to his Church are contained therein,

ſhould

ſhould vary this method of his, and entertain ſome melancholy and retired women, or other Enthuſiaſtical perſons with viſions and revelations of no uſe to his Church?

6. Whether God doth ever Inſpire perſons with immediate revelations without giving ſufficient evidence of ſuch Inſpiration? For if he did, it were to leave men under a temptation to Infidelity without means to withſtand it; if he doth not, then we have reaſon to examine the evidence, before we believe the revelation. The evidence God gave of old was either the Prophecy of a ſucceſſion of *Prophets*, by one whoſe commiſſion was atteſted by great miracles, as *Moſes*, who told the Iſraelites, they were to expect *Prophets*, and laid down *rules* to judge of them by; or elſe by *miracles* wrought by themſelves as by the *Apoſtles* whom our *Lord* ſent abroad to declare his will to the world. And where theſe are not, what reaſon is there to receive any new Revelations as from *God*, eſpecially when the main predictions of the New Teſtament are of *falſe Prophets*, and *falſe Miracles*?

7. Whether the *Revelations* of their pretended *Saints* being *countenanced* by the *Authority* of their *Church*, be equally received among them, with the Revelations contained in *Scripture*? if they be, then they ought to

have equal reverence paid to them, and they ought to read them as *Scripture*, to cite their Authority as divine, and to believe them as infallible as *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*; if they be not, than whatever they pretend, they are not looked on as divine revelations by them, as manifeſtly appears, becauſe they are wholly rejected by ſome of the wiſeſt of them, doubted of, and diſputed by others, as it were eaſie to prove were it not too large a ſubject for this diſcourſe, but by none received as writings of divine authority, and equal with the *Scriptures*, which they muſt be if they came from the ſame Spirit. And ſince they are not, it is evident that they are no otherwiſe eſteemed among themſelves, than as the *Fanatick* heats of ſome devout perſons of diſturbed and deluded Fancies; whom notwithſtanding they are willing to cheriſh, partly becauſe they are loth to diſcountenance any pretence to an *infallible Spirit* in their Church, and partly that there may never be wanting matter to make *Saints* of, when the *Pope* thinks fit, and good conſideration is offered. This may ſuffice to make good this charge of *Fanaticiſm* againſt the *Roman Church*; and to ſhew that I am as far from the appearance of any contradiction therein (although their Revelations are not from a real one) as *J. W*'s vain and Sophiſtical talk is from any appearance of reaſon.

The

The last contradiction charged upon me, is, *about the Divisions of the Roman Church*. The occasion of which discourse was, that *divisions* were objected to me as another consequent of the *Reformation*; upon which I thought my self obliged to enquire into the *Unity* of their *Church*, and I have at large proved from undenyable Instances, attested by their own Authors, that they have no reason to insult over other *Churches* on account of their divisions, nor to boast of their own Unity and Peace. For I have there proved that there have never been greater disturbances in the Christian World, than what they call the means of Unity, *viz.* the *Popes Authority*, hath procured, no where greater or more lasting *Schisms*, no where fiercer disputes about matters of order and doctrine, than among them. I considered all their *salvo's* and from them shew'd, that if they have no divisions among themselves neither have we; nay, the same arguments which prove they do not differ in matters of faith from each other, do likewise prove that they and we do not differ from each other in those things. And what saith *J. W.* to all this? Instead of healing their own divisions, he only designs to prove me to be divided against my self, that he might make up the full Tale of his contradictions.

§. 8. No contradiction in the charge of divisions.

But *J. W.* had ſo much forgot himſelf as to make good the very thing I deſigned; and by that very argument he uſes to prove that I contradict my ſelf, he manifeſtly proves that there are no more diviſions in matters of faith, between the *Roman Church* and *us* than there are among themſelves. This I ſhall make very evident, but I muſt proceed as he doth with his Propoſitions.

1. *No diviſions from the Roman Church are diviſions of the Roman Church.* This is a very ſubtle principle of unity among them, and by this rule there would be an admirable Unity in the Roman Church, if the Pope himſelf were left alone in it. For all others would only be *divided from* it, and I would allow the *Pope* to be at a very good Agreement with himſelf, which is more than *J. W.* will allow me: In this caſe indeed there would be *Unity*, but where would be their *Church*? Suppoſe a ſhepherd ſhould boaſt of the excellent Government of a great Flock he had under his command, and the Unity and peace they lived in; and a by-ſtander ſhould tell him that he ſaw others pretend to the ſame authority over that flock that he did, and part followed one and part another, he ſaw ſome of the chief of the Leaders ſet themſelves againſt him diſputing his authority, he ſaw many of the ſheep continually fighting with

with each other, and ſome had wholly forſaken him; would it not be a pleaſant thing for this ſhepherd to ſay that notwithſtanding all this they had great peace and Unity, becauſe as many as did not quarrel were very quiet, and thoſe that were divided from his Government were not under it? But our queſtion is, whether ſuch authority be the means to preſerve the whole flock under Government, when we ſee it prevents no diviſions but cauſes many? He might have ſpoken more to the purpoſe if he had framed his Propoſition thus, *there can be no diviſions in the Roman Church, but ſuch as divide men from it*; and in that caſe the *Roman Church* would have been reduced to a very ſmall number. But if there may be ſuch *diviſions* which are as contrary to Unity and peace as diviſions *in matters of faith* are, to what purpoſe is it to ſhew that they have none in one kind if they have very great in all others? But although this be not ſufficient to demonſtrate their *Unity*, yet it is enough for his purpoſe, if it doth ſhew that I contradict my ſelf. But where lyes the contradiction? The force of it lyes here. *I charge them with diviſions in matters of faith, when diviſions in matters of faith make them not to be members of the Roman Church; therefore there can be no diviſions in the Roman Church in matters of*

faith. Again (for in theſe two arguments the ſubſtance of his own propoſitions is couched by himſelf) *All thoſe who aſſent unto the ancient Creeds are undivided in matters of faith; but all Roman Catholicks aſſent unto the ancient Creeds*; ergo, *all Roman Catholicks are undivided in matters of faith, and conſequently it is a calumny in me to ſay they are divided in theſe matters.* Now, what an eaſie matter is it to diſpoſſeſs me of this *ſpirit of contradiction*, which he imagines me *poſſeſſed with?* I need no holy water, or ſacred charms and exorciſms to do it with. There needs no more but underſtanding what is meant *by matters of faith*; when *matters of faith* are ſpoken of by me in the place he refers to, it is evident to every one that reads it, and by his own words I ſpeak only of *the Fundamental and neceſſary articles of faith, which are neceſſary to the ſalvation of all and to the very being of a Church*; of which kind I ſay none ought to be eſteemed, that were not admitted into the ancient *Creeds.* But when I charge them with diviſions *in matters of faith*, I do not mean that they reject the ancient Creeds, but I take *matters of faith* in their own ſenſe for *things defined by the Church*; and if *J. W.* had ſought for any thing but words to raiſe cavils upon, he might have found it ſo explained in

Rational Account. p. 56.

the

the very place where I ſpeak of this. For that diſcourſe is to anſwer an objection of theirs, *that they do not differ in thoſe things which they eſteem matters of faith*; and particularly I inſiſted upon that, that they cannot be ſure whether they differ *in matters of faith* or no, becauſe they are not agreed what makes things to become *matters of faith*. Can this be underſtood any other way than of their *own ſenſe* of matters of faith? And is not this fair dealing to make me contradict my ſelf becauſe where I argue againſt them I take *matters of faith* in *their ſenſe*, and where I deliver my own opinion, I take them in *another ſenſe*? And this being the ſenſe of matters of faith the trifling of his arguing appears; for do all theſe ceaſe to be members of their *Church* who diſpute any thing which others account *matter of faith* among them? Are the *Jeſuits* all out of the *Church* of *Rome*, becauſe they deny the efficacy of *Grace* which the *Dominicans* account *a matter of faith?* Are the *Janſeniſts* and *oral Traditioniſts* divided from the *Church* of *Rome* becauſe they deny the *Popes Infallibility* which the *Jeſuits* account a matter of faith? If not, then *all diviſions in matters and articles of faith, are not diviſions from the true Church and from all her members*; and ſo his ſecond Propoſition comes to nothing: and ſo likewiſe the third, *that*

Diviſ. of the Rom. Church. ſ. 15. p. 397. 2. ed.

all diviſions in matters of faith, ſo eſteemed by them, are diviſions from the Roman Church.

But the fourth and fifth Propoſitions are the moſt healing Principles that have yet been thought on. Fie for ſhame! why ſhould we and they of the *Church* of *Rome* quarrel thus long? we are very well agreed in all *matters of faith*, and I ſhall demonſtratively prove it from the argument of *J. W.* drawn from his two laſt *Propoſitions*. *All who aſſent unto the ancient Creeds are undivided in matters of faith, by* Prop. 4. but both *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants* do *aſſent unto the ancient Creeds*; ergo, *they are nndivided in matters of faith* And hath not *J. W.* now done his buſineſs, and very ſubſtantially proved the thing he intended? But I hope we may enjoy the benefit of it, as well as thoſe of the *Church* of *Rome*; and that they will not hence forward charge us with *dividing from their Church* in any matters of faith, ſince we are all agreed in owning the *ancient Creeds*; and ſeeing, we cannot be *divided from the Church* but by differing *in matters of faith* according to his *Propoſ.* it follows that we are ſtill members of the *true Church*, and therefore neither guilty of *hereſie* nor *Schiſm*. But if thoſe who do own and aſſent to the ancient *Creeds* may yet be divided *in matters of faith*, as they charge us by rejecting the *definitions* of the *Roman Church*, then

there

there is no ſhadow of a contradiction left in my charging them with *differences* in matters of faith among themſelves, though I ſay, they own the *ancient Creeds.*

And now, Reader, thou ſeeſt what all theſe pitiful cavils are come to; and what ground there hath been for them to glory in this *Puſionello*, that *with a ſheet and a half hath compelled me*, as he ſaith, *to be my own Executioner.* But theſe great *Heroes* muſt be allowed to relate their famous adventures, with ſome advantage to themſelves: it might have been enough to have reſcued the *Lady*, but not only to deſtroy the *Giant* (as any man muſt be accounted whom ſuch *Knights* encounter) but to leave him grovelling in the ground and gaſping for breath, and that by wounds he forced him to give himſelf, this is beyond meaſure glorious. Go thy way then for the *eighth Champion* of *Chriſtendom*, enjoy the benefit of thy illuſtrious fame, ſit down at eaſe, and relate to thy immortal honour thy mighty exploits; only when thou haſt done, remember thou haſt encountred nothing but the *Wind-mills* of thy own imagination, and the man whom thou thought'ſt to have executed by his own hands, ſtands by and laughs at thy ridiculous attempts. But I forget, that I am ſo near his Concluſion, wherein he doth ſo gravely adviſe me *that I would be pleaſed for once to write Controveſies, not*

§. 9. The Concluſion. P. 14.

not Play-Books : his meaning I ſuppoſe, is, that I would return to the old beaten road where they know how to find a man, and have ſomething to ſay becauſe others have ſaid ſomething before them; and not repreſent the ridiculous paſſages of their *Fanaticks*; for the defence of which they are furniſht with no Diſtinctions out of their uſual Magazines, their preſent *Manuals of Controverſie*. I ſhall be contented to wait their leiſure if they have any thing material to ſay; as *J. W.* gives me ſome hopes, when he ſaith, *that other more learned pens* (I ſhall be glad to ſee them) *will give me a more particular and compleat anſwer*. I hope not in the way of cavilling; if they do, I ſhall hereafter only contemn them; but I am afraid of their good intentions by the Books he mentions as ſuch conſiderable things in anſwer to my Vindication of *Arch-biſhop Laud*, viz. *the Guide in Controverſies*, and *Proteſtancy without Principles*; if others write as they have done, I ſhall take as little notice of them as I have done of thoſe. Cannot a dull Book come out with *my name in the Title*, but I muſt be obliged to anſwer it? no, I aſſure them I know better how to ſpend my time. I ſay ſtill, let a juſt anſwer come forth, that deals by me as I did by the Book I anſwered, and then let them blame me, if I neglect it. But at laſt he gives one general reaſon why no great matter is to be expected

to come abroad in Print: *not, but that they have men of learning among them:* No doubt of it: but alas for them! they are ſo perſecuted in the Printing Houſes that nothing of theirs is ſuffered to come abroad, only by great good fortune this complaint is in Print and comes abroad openly enough. How long I pray have theſe days of perſecution been? For, whatever you imagine I was ſo far *from having any hand in it*, that the firſt time I ever heard of it, was from your complaints. Have you not formerly complained thus, when Books too many have been Printed and publiſhed in *England?* And what aſſurance can you give us that you do not ſtill complain without cauſe? But, not to ſuffer you to deceive the people any longer in this kind (by pretending that this is the reaſon why you do not anſwer our Books, becauſe you have no liberty of the Preſs) I have at this time a Catalogue by me of above two hundred *Popiſh Books* Printed in our own language(which I ſhall produce on a juſt occaſion) a conſiderable part whereof have been publiſhed within the compaſs of not many years. And yet *all poſſible efforts are uſed by us* (ſaith *J. W.*) *to hinder their Doctors from ſhewing their learning*; this of late we muſt needs ſay, they have very ſparingly done; but all the arts we have, cannot hinder ſome of them from ſhewing their *weakneſs*, as this *J. W.* hath very prodigally done in this *Pamphlet*. *Finis.* P. 114.

AN ANSWER TO THE BOOK,

Entituled,

Dr. *Stillingfleet's Principles* Conſidered.

§. 1. The occaſion of annexing the Principles.

ALthough I write no *Plays*, yet I hope I may have leave to ſay the *ſcene* is *changed*; for inſtead of the former *Sophiſter*, one now comes forth in the habit of a grave *Divine*, whom I ſhall treat with the reſpect due to his appearance of Modeſty and Civility. I paſs by therefore all thoſe unhandſome reflections in his Preface, which I have not already anſwered in mine, and come immediately to the main Controverſie between us, which I acknowledge

ledge to be of so great importance as to deserve a sober debate. And the Controversie in short is this, Whether Protestants who reject the Roman Churches Authority and Infallibility, can have any sufficient Foundation to build their faith upon? This we affirm, and those of the Church of *Rome* confidently deny; and on this account do charge us with the want of Principles, *i.e.* sufficient grounds for our faith. But this may be understood two ways. 1. That we can have no certainty of our faith *as Christians* without their Infallibility. 2. Or that we can have no certainty of our faith *as Protestants*, *i.e.* in the matters in debate between their Church and ours. These two ought carefully to be distinguished from each other: and although the *Principles* I laid down, do reach to both these, yet that they were chiefly intended for the former, will appear by the occasion of adding them to the end of the Answer there given. The occasion was, my Adversaries calling for *Grounds* and *Principles*; upon which I there say, that I would give an account of the faith of Protestants in the way of Principles, and of the reason of our rejecting their impositions. The first I undertook on two accounts. 1. To shew that the Roman Churches Authority and Infallibility cannot be the Foundation of Christian faith,

P. 483. 2. ed.

and

and so we may be very good Christians without having any thing to do with the Church of *Rome*. 2. That this might serve as a sufficient answer to a Book entituled *Protestants without Principles*. Which being in some part of it directed against me I had reason, not only to lay down those *Principles*, bnt to do it in such a manner as did most directly overthrow the principles of that Book.

Which being only intimated there, I must now to make my proceeding more clear and evident, produce those assertions of *E.W.* for which mine were intended. In the first Chapter he designs to prove, *That all men must be infallible in the assent they give to matters of faith. For*, saith he, *If they disown such infallible believers, they must joyntly deny all infallible faith*: and a little after, *an Infallible verity revealed to us forcibly requires an answerable and correspondent infallible faith in us*: and therefore he asserts *a subjective Infallibility in true believers*. And from hence he proves *the necessity of Infallible teachers*; for *infallible believers and infallible teachers*, he saith, *seem meer correlatives*. In the second Chapter he saith, *he that hears an infallible teacher hath the Spirit of truth, and he that hears not an infallible teacher wants this Spirit of truth*; by which he does not mean an infallible Revealer of the doctrine

Protestants without Principles, *Chap.* 1.

P. 17.

P. 18.

P. 19.

P. 20.

doctrine at first; but the immediate teachers
P. 21. of the revealed doctrine, for, saith he, *no man can be a Heretick that denies the objective verities revealed in Gods word, unless he be sure that his teacher reveals those verities in-*
P. 22. *fallibly.* He proposes the objection of *a Simplician*, as he calls him, *that he builds his faith and Religion, not on any Preachers talk but on the objective verities revealed in Scripture:* to which he answers, *that unless he first learn of some infallible Oracle, the sense of Scripture in controverted places, he can never arrive to the depth of Gods true meaning, or derive infallible faith from those objective revealed Verities.* He yet farther
P. 23. asserts, *that every Catechist, or Preacher that hath a lawful mission, and is sent by the infallible Church to teach Christs Sacred Doctrine, if he Preach that doctrine which Christ and his Church approves of, is then under that notion of a member conjoyned with an Infallible Church, infallible in his teaching:*
P. 24. and thence concludes, *that infallibility doth accompany both teachers and hearers: and*
P. 25. *from denying this Infallibility*, he saith, *follows an utter ruine of Christian Religion yea and of Scripture too.* And afterwards he goes about to prove that no man can have any divine faith without infallibility in the
P. 42, 43. proponent; for, saith he, *as long as the Infallibility*

libility of a Revelation ſtands remote from me for want of an undoubted application made by an infallible Proponent, it can no more tranſfuſe Certainty into Faith, than Fire at a great diſtance, warm. This is the ſum of the *Principles* of that *Metaphyſical wit*; but ſure a man muſt have his brains well confounded by *School Divinity* and hard words, before he can have common ſenſe little enough to think he underſtands them. But becauſe I never loved to ſpend time in confuting a man, who thinks himſelf the wiſer for ſpeaking things, which neither he nor any one elſe can underſtand; I rather choſe in as ſhort a way as I could, to put together ſuch Propoſitions, as might give an account of *Chriſtian Faith* without all this *Jargon* about Infallibility. In order to this, I firſt laid down the *Principles* wherein all parties are agreed; and then ſuch Propoſitions as I ſuppoſed would ſufficiently give an account of our faith, without any neceſſity of ſuch an infallibility as he makes neceſſary for the foundation of it.

§. 2. Of the notion of infallibility.

But for our clearer proceeding in an Argument of this importance, it will be neceſſary to ſtate and fix the notion of *Infallibility* before I come to particulars. For as it is uſed it ſeems to be a rare word for *Jugglers* in *Divinity* to play tricks with; for ſometimes they apply it to the *object* that is believed, and call that

infallibly true; ſometimes to the *ſubject* capable of believing, and ſay perſons ought to be *infallibly certain* that what they believe is *infallibly true*; and ſometimes to the *means* of conveying that infallible truth to the faculties of men, and theſe they ſay muſt be *infallible*, or elſe there can be no *infallible certainty* of any thing as *infallibly true*. But the ſubtilty of theſe things lies only in their obſcurity; and the School-man is ſpoiled when his talk is brought down out of the clouds to common ſenſe: I will therefore trie to bring theſe things out of their terms to a plain meaning; and ſurely we may ſpeak and underſtand each other in theſe matters without this doubtful term of *Infallibility*. For if it ſignifies any thing, we may make uſe of the thing it ſignifies inſtead of the word, and by applying the thing ſignified by it, to that which it is ſpoken of, we ſhall ſoon diſcern how juſtly it is attributed to it. *Infallbile* is that which cannot be deceived; now if no one will ſay, That a *propoſition cannot be deceived*, it is abſurd to ſay *that it is infallibly true*; therefore the matters revealed conſidered *as objective verities*, as our *Schoolman* ſpeaks, are not capable of *Infallibility*; which cannot belong to the *truth* propoſed, but to him that propounds or believes it. For *to be deceived* or *not to be deceived*, are proper only to *perſons*; and the impoſſi-

impoſſibility of being deceived does in truth belong only to an infinitely perfect underſtanding; for what ever underſtanding is imperfect, is of it ſelf liable to errour and miſtake. And yet an underſtanding liable to be deceived may not be deceived, and be ſure it is not. The higheſt aſſurance of not being deceived, is from Gods revealing any thing to men; for we know it impoſſible that God ſhould be deceived, or go about to deceive mankind in what he obliges them to believe as true. This then is granted, that whatever any perſon ſpeaks immediately from God, he cannot be deceived in it; but men may be deceived in thinking they ſpeak from God when they do not. There is then no difficulty in the firſt, that what ever perſons are inſpired by God are *infallible* in what they ſpeak; but the main difficulty is about the aſſurance which *God* gives to *men* that they are inſpired. Two ways it may be conceived that men cannot be deceived in this matter. 1. If God inſpires every particular perſon with the belief of this, and gives him ſuch evidence thereof as cannot be falſe. 2. Or if God ſhall inſpire ſome perſons in every Age to aſſure the World, that thoſe before them were inſpired: but notwithſtanding this, particular perſons may be deceived, in believing thoſe inſpired who are not; and to prevent this, nothing can be ſufficient but divine

revelation to every particular perſon that he hath appointed thoſe *infallible Guides* in his *Church*, to aſſure men that he had at firſt ſetled his *Church* by perſons that were *infallible*; but then, why might not ſuch a particular Revelation aſſure men as well immediately that Chriſt and his holy Apoſtles were *infallible*, as that the *Guides* of the preſent *Church* are *infallible?* For it is unconceivable that perſons ſhould be more infallible in judging the Inſpiration of the preſent Guides, than of the firſt Founders of the Church. And ſuppoſing men not inſpired, they may be deceived in believing this *infallibility* of the preſent Church, and if they may be deceived, how can their Faith be *infallible?* ſo that nothing can make the faith of particular perſons infallible, but private inſpiration which muſt reſolve all Faith into *Enthuſiaſm* and immediate revelation. And nothing can be more abſurd than to ſay, *That there are infallible Believers without infallible Inſpiration*; or *that an infallible Proponent can transfuſe infallibility into faith*, unleſs the infallibility of that Proponent be firſt made known to the Believer in ſuch a way as he cannot be deceived in. For in matters of divine Revelation, the main thing we are to enquire after, is the *infallibility* of thoſe who delivered this doctrine to the World. And although the reaſon of believing what God

ſaith,

ſaith, be his own infallibility, which is natural and eſſential to him; yet the reaſon of my aſſenting to this or that doctrine, as coming from God, muſt be an aſſurance that God hath ſecured thoſe perſons from miſtake whom he hath imployed to make known the doctrine to the World. Thoſe perſons then whom God inſpired, are the *Proponents of matters of faith to us:* and if they give us ſufficient reaſon to believe that they were inſpired, we are bound to believe them, otherwiſe not. But to ſuppoſe that we cannot believe the firſt infallible *Proponents*, unleſs there be ſuch in every Age, is to make more difficulties, and to anſwer none. For then all my belief of the *infallibility* of the *firſt Proponents*, muſt depend on the evidence which the *preſent Guides* of the Church give of their *infallibility*, who yet cannot pretend to the ſame evidence which they had: and here is no difficulty anſwered, for we are certainly bound as much to enquire into the reaſon of our believing the preſent Guides of the Church *infallible*, as the Apoſtles: and if men cannot be infallible in believing the *Apoſtles*, unleſs there be other infallible *Proponents* in every Age, to aſſure them that the Apoſtles were inſpired, why muſt not the infallibility of theſe preſent *Proponents* be likewiſe ſo atteſted as well as of the Apoſtles? and what undoubted application

can be made of the Churches *infallibility*, unleſs there be ſome other *infallible Proponent* ſtill to *transfuſe certainty into my belief* of that, by vertue of which, I muſt believe all other matters of Faith, which is the *Churches Infallibility?* So that the *laſt Proponent* muſt either be believed for himſelf without any further evidence, and then the ſhorter way would be to believe the firſt ſo, or elſe there will be an *endleſs infallibility*; or at laſt all muſt be reſolved into the *Enthuſiaſm* of every particular perſon, if we do not reſt ſatisfied with the *rational evidence* which thoſe perſons, who were inſpired by God, did give to the World that they were ſent by him: and then let the World judge whether *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* did not give ſtronger evidence that they were ſent from God, than the *Pope* or the *Guides* of the preſent *Church* do? and if ſo, whether it be poſſible for men to do greater diſſervice to Chriſtianity, than to ſuſpend our belief of the *Inſpiration* of the *Founders* of the *Chriſtian Church*, on a thing, at leaſt, far leſs evident than the thing to be believed by it is? but in plain Engliſh, on a thing notoriouſly falſe; and only the arrogant pretence of an uſurping Faction, which thinks it eaſier boldly to ſay that *it cannot be deceived*, than to defend it ſelf againſt the juſt accuſations both *of deceiving, and being deceived.*

These things being premised, I now come to consider how far *N. O.* hath shewed the invalidity of the *Principles* laid down by me, for the end for which I intended them. The design of them was to shew, that we may have sufficient *Certainty* of our Faith, without the *Infallibility* of the *Roman Church*; the Answerer hath yielded some things and denied others. I shall therefore first lay down his *Concessions*, and see of what force they are to the issue of this Controversie, and then come fairly to debate the matters in difference between us. §. 3. *N. O.* concessions.

I. For his Concessions.

1. He yields, *That there is no necessity at all of Infallibility under natural Religion:* which was implied in the second and third *Propositions* which are granted by him.

For in the second Proposition I assert, That Man being framed a rational Creature capable of reflecting upon himself, may antecedently to any external Revelation certainly know the being of God, and his dependence upon him; else there could be no such thing as a Law of Nature, or any Principles of Natural Religion: *which*, he saith, *may be granted.* Prop. 2.

All supernatural and external Revelation, must suppose the truth of Natural Religion; for unless we be antecedently certain that there Prop. 3.

is a God, and that we are capable of knowing him, it is impoſſible to be certain, that God hath revealed his Will to us by any ſupernatural means. *Let this be granted*, ſaith he. From whence it follows that we have ſufficient certainty of the Principles of Natural Religion, without any ſuch thing as *Infallibility*.

2. He yields, *That Reaſon is to be judge concerning divine Revelation*; which appears by the next Propoſition.

Prop. 4. Nothing ought to be admitted for Divine Revelation, which overthrows the certainty of thoſe Principles which muſt be antecedently ſuppoſed to all Divine Revelation: for that were to overthrow the means whereby we are to judge concerning the truth of any Divine Revelation. Of which, he ſaith, *Let this alſo be granted.*

3. He yields, *That the Will of God may be ſufficiently declared to men by writing*, for *he grants* the tenth Propoſition, which is this.

Prop. 10. If the Will of God cannot be ſufficiently declared to men by writing, it muſt either be, becauſe no writing can be intelligible enough for that end, or that it can never be known to be written by men infallibly aſſiſted; the former is repugnant to common ſenſe, for words are equally capable of being underſtood, ſpoken or written; the latter overthrows the poſ-

ſibility

ſibility of the Scriptures being known to be the Word of God. *This*, ſaith he, *is granted.*

4. He yields, *That the written will of God doth contain all things ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation.* For in his conſideration of the 14. Propoſition, theſe are his words: *Mean while as touching the Perfection of holy Scriptures, Catholicks now, as the holy Fathers anciently, do grant that they contain all points, which are ſimply neceſſary to be of all perſons believed for attaining ſalvation.* P.22.S.15.

5. He yields, *That no perſon is infallibly certain of or in his Faith, becauſe the Proponent thereof is infallible, unleſs he alſo certainly know, or have infallible evidence that he is infallible*; only he adds, *That for begetting an infallible aſſent to the thing propoſed, it is ſufficient if we have an infallible evidence either of the thing propoſed, or of the Proponent only.* Which is all I deſire as to this matter. But he quarrels with me for ſaying, Propoſition 21. It is neceſſary therefore in order to an infallible aſſent, that every particular perſon be infallibly aſſiſted, in judging of the matters propoſed to be believed: *Becauſe*, ſaith he, *it is not neceſſary to have an infallible evidence of the truth of the things propoſed, i. e. from the internal principles that prove or demonſtrate them; but it is enough that he have* P.52.

an

an infallible or ſufficiently certain evidence only of the infallibility of the external Proponent. Where there are two things to be taken notice of. 1. That by the *matters propoſed to be believed*, he would ſeem to underſtand me only of the things that are to be believed by vertue of any Proponent ſuppoſed infallible; whereas I meant it of all ſuch things to which *an infallible aſſent* is required, and chiefly of that by which we are to believe the things revealed; as for inſtance, *that the Church is infallible*, is in the firſt place to be believed upon their principles, and either an *infallible aſſent* is required to this or not; if not, then *infallibility is not neceſſary to faith*; if it be, then this infallible aſſent muſt be built on an infallibility antecedent to that of the Church; and then my conſequence neceſſarily follows, that the ground on which a neceſſity of ſome external infallible Proponent is aſſerted, muſt rather make every particular perſon infallible, if no divine Faith can be without an infallible aſſent, and ſo renders any other Infallibility uſeleſs.

2. That he explains *infallible evidence* by that which is *ſufficiently certain*, which is meer ſhuffling: for he knows well enough that we contend for *ſufficiently certain evidence* as much as they; our only Queſtion is about *infallibility*, whether that be neceſſary or no? If *ſufficiently certain evidence* will ſerve for the

the Churches Infallibility, why may it not for the *Scriptures*, or any matters of Faith contained therein? If they mean no more by *Infallibility* but *ſufficient certainty*, why do they make ſo great a noiſe about it, as though there could be no Faith and we no Chriſtians without Infallibility? when we all ſay that the matters of Faith have *ſufficient certainty*, nay the higheſt which ſuch things are capable of. Is *infallible Faith* come to be *ſufficiently certain* only? for all that I know an *infallible* Pope may by ſuch another explication become like one of us.

6. He yields, *That a right and ſaving faith may be without any infallible aſſurance concerning the Churches Infallibility. Which*, he ſaith, *is abundantly declared by Catholick Writers.* P. 54. I only deſire to know, why a like right and ſaving faith may not be had concerning the *Scriptures*, without their *Churches* infallibility? For from hence it follows, that an *infallible aſſent* is not requiſite to ſaving faith; directly contrary to my former Adverſary *E.W.* for one ſaith, *it is neceſſary to faith*, and the other, *that it is not.* But above all, how will he ever anſwer this to Mr. *J. S.* who hath written a whole Book purpoſely againſt this Principle, as impious and atheiſtical? Methinks this way of defending the main foundation of their Faith by Principles ſo directly

contra-

contradicting one another looks a little ſcandalouſly, and brings an odd ſuſpition upon their Cauſe, as if it were very hard to be made good, when our Adverſaries cannot agree by which of two quite contrary Principles it was beſt be maintained.

P. 56. 7. He yields, *That the utmoſt aſſurance a man can have of the Churches Infallibility, is only moral*; but to make it up, he calls it a *moral infallibility*; which, how ſtrangely ſoever it ſounds, yet his meaning is good; for it is ſuch an infallibility, as is not infallibility. Hath the diſpute been thus long among us, whether *infallibility* be neceſſary or no to faith, and now at laſt one comes and tells us, Yes ſurely, a *moral infallibility* is neceſſary. I have heard of a hot diſpute between two Gentlemen about *Tranſubſtantiation*, very earneſt they were on both ſides; at laſt another falls into their company and asked them what it was they were about; they told him *Tranſubſtantiation*: very well, ſaid he, but I pray tell me what you mean by it; one ſaid it was *ſtanding* at the Euchariſt, and the other *kneeling*. Much ſuch another explication is this here of *Infallibility*, only this is ſomewhat worſe, for it is joyning two words together which deſtroy each other; for if it be only *moral Certainty*, it is not *infallible*; if it be *infallible*, it cannot be barely *moral*. I expect to hear ſhortly of an accidental

dental Tranſubſtantiation, a co-ordinate Supremacy, as well as a *moral Infallibility*. But we are to ſuppoſe that by *Infallibility* he means no more than *Certainty*, becauſe he explains it *by the Certainty of univerſal Tradition*: this were well enough, if in the precedent Page he had not ſaid, *That a particular perſon may be infallible in the aſſent he gives to ſome matter propoſed*, viz. *to this, that the Church is infallible*; I would fain underſtand what this *infallible aſſent* is grounded upon, and if the evidence be only *ſufficiently or morally infallible*, which are his own terms, how the *aſſent* which is built upon it, comes to be more than ſo. It is very pleaſant to obſerve how Mr. *Creſſey*, and ſome other late *Writers* of their Church are perplexed about this word *Infallibility*, as if they had a Wolf by the ears, they cannot tell how to hold it, and they are afraid to let it go. And very loth is is our *N. O.* to part with the ſound of *Infallibility*, although his own Conceſſions perfectly overthrow it, as will yet further appear by this laſt, *viz.* P. 55.

8. *That moral Certainty is a ſufficient foundation for Faith.* This will appear by my 27. Propoſition, which is this: The nature of certainty doth receive ſeveral names either according to the nature of the proof, or the degrees of the Aſſent. Thus Moral Certainty Prop. 27.

may

may be ſo called, either as it is oppoſed to Mathematical evidence, but implying a firm aſſent upon the higheſt evidence that Moral things can receive: Or as it is oppoſed to a higher degree of Certainty in the ſame kind, ſo Moral Certainty implies only greater Probabilities of one ſide than the other. In the former ſenſe we aſſert the certainty of Chriſtian Faith to be Moral, but not only in the latter. To which he ſaith, *This Principle is granted, if importing only that Chriſtians have or may have a ſufficiently certain and infallible evidence of the truth of their Chriſtianity.* Whereby it is plain that though he uſeth the term *infallible*, yet he means no more than I do, or elſe he ought not to have brought that as an explication of my principle which is contrary to it, as in this Controverſie, *Moral Certainty* is oppoſed to ſtrict demonſtration and Infallibility. But if he by *infallibility* means only *ſufficient certainty*, I ſhall be content for quietneſs ſake, that he ſhall call it *Infallibility*, if he pleaſes. And that he can mean no more by it, appears not only by what he hath ſaid before, but by what he ſaith afterwards in theſe words. *A Natural or Moral Certainty (though not ſuch a one as cannot poſſibly be falſe, but which according to the Laws of Nature and the common manners and experience of Men is not falſe) is ſufficient on which*

P. 67.

P. 94.

which to ground ſuch a faith as God requires of us; in reſpect of that Certainty which can be derived from humane ſenſe or reaſon, and which ſerves for an introductive to the reliance of this our faith upon ſuch Revelation as is believed by us divine; and which if divine, we know is not poſſibly fallible; In reſpect of its relying on which Revelation, an infallible object, and not for an Infallible Certainty as to the ſubject, it is that this our Faith is denominated a Divine Faith. Now this Natural or Moral Certainty is thought ſufficient for the firſt rational Introductive and Security of our Faith, not only by the Doctor in his 27. Principle, but alſo by Catholick Divines in their Diſcourſes of the Prudential Motives. Very well ſaid, and I were a very diſingenuous man, if I ſhould not heartily thank him for ſo free a Confeſſion, by which, if I underſtand any thing, he very fairly gives up the Cauſe of *Infallibility*, as to the neceſſity of it in order to Faith: As will eaſily appear by the managing of it, ſo far as I have been concerned in it. It is evident to any one that will caſt an eye on the Controverſie of *Infallibility*, between the Arch-biſhop and his Adverſaries, that it was raiſed on this account, becauſe thoſe of the Church of *Rome* aſſerted, that the Infallible Teſtimony of the Church was neceſſary in order to the believing the Scriptures to be the

Word

Word of God: and ſo much is endeavoured to be defended by him who pretended to anſwer my Lord of *Canterburies* Book, who goes upon this Principle, ***That this is to be believed with a divine Faith, and a divine Faith muſt be built upon an infallible Teſtimony***; the falſehood of which, I at large ſhewed in the Diſcourſe of the Reſolution of Faith. Since the publiſhing whereof, the Metaphyſical Gentleman before mentioned, pretended to anſwer that part of it which concerns ***Infallibility*** and ***Moral Certainty.*** Some of his Aſſertions I have laid down already, as contrary to this of *N. O.* as may be; for he not only aſſerts the neceſſity of ***Infallibility for a foundation of Chriſtian Faith***, but ſpends ſome Chapters in rambling talk againſt ***Moral Certainty.*** The Title of one of which is, ***Faith only Morally Certain is no Faith.*** I deſire *N. O.* and *E. W.* to agree better before they goe about to confute me; and to what purpoſe ſhould I trouble my ſelf with anſwering a man whoſe Principles the more ingenuous of their own Party diſown, as well as we? For not only *N. O.* here makes ***Moral Certainty a ſufficient grounnd for Divine Faith***, but the *Guide in Controverſies*, another of my Adverſaries, aſſerts the ſame, when he ſaith, ***And indeed from what is ſaid formerly, that a Divine Faith may be had by thoſe who have had no extrin-***

Prot. without Princip. Chap. 6.

Guide in Controv. diſc. 5. chap. 10. S. 134.

extrinſecal even morally infallible (I ſee now from whom N. O. learnt theſe terms) *motive thereof, it follows that Divine Faith doth not reſolve into ſuch motives either as the formal cauſe, or always as the applicative introductive, or condition of this divine faith.* And a little after, *That it is not neceſſary that ſuch Faith always ſhould have an external rationally infallible ground or motive thereto (whether Church Authority or any other) on his part that ſo believes.* By theſe conceſſions it appears that the cauſe of *Infallibility*, as far as it concerns the neceſſity of it in order to Faith, is clearly given up by theſe perſons; and if others be ſtill of another mind among them, I leave them to diſpute it among themſelves. Sect. 135.

§ 4. N. O's. Principles laid down.

Thus far then we are agreed; I now come to conſider where the controverſie ſtill remains, and why the reſt of my *Principles* may not paſs as well as theſe. In order to this, I muſt, by taking a view of his ſeveral exceptions and anſwers, draw together a *Scheme* of thoſe *Principles* which he ſets up in oppoſition to mine; and if I do not very much miſtake, they may be reduced to theſe three.

1. That God hath given an infallible aſſiſtance to the Guides of the Church in all Ages of it, for the direction of thoſe who live in it.

2. That without this infallible aſſiſtance

there can be no certainty of the ſenſe of Scripture.

3. That all the Arguments which overthrow the Churches Infallibility, do deſtroy the Churches Authority.

Theſe, as far as I can perceive, contain the whole force of his *Conſiderations*; and in the examination of theſe the remaining diſcourſe muſt be ſpent; In which I ſhall have occaſion to take notice of whatever is material in his Book.

1. The main controverſie is, whether God hath given an infallible aſſiſtance to the Guides of the Church in all Ages, for the conduct of thoſe who live in it? For if he hath not, my Adverſary cannot deny, but the *Principles* laid down by me muſt hold. For in caſe there be no infallibility in the Guides of the Church, every one muſt be left to the uſe of his own underſtanding, proceeding in the beſt manner, to find out what the Will of God is in order to ſalvation. We do not now diſpute concerning the beſt helps for a perſon to make uſe of in a matter of this nature; but the Queſtion is, whether a man ought to reſign his own judgement to that of the Church, which pretends to be infallible as to all neceſſaries for ſalvation? or ſuppoſing no ſuch infallibility, whether a perſon uſing his Faculties in the beſt manner about the ſenſe of *Scriptures*, with the helps of divine

divine Grace, may not have ſufficient certainty thereby what things are required of him in order to happineſs? Hereby I exclude nothing that may tend to the right uſe of a mans underſtanding in theſe things, whether it be the direction of Paſtors, the decrees of Councils, the ſenſe of the Primitive Church, or the care, induſtry, and ſincerity of the Enquirer; but ſuppoſing all theſe, whether by not believing the Guides of the Church to be infallible, *the foundation of this perſons faith can be nothing elſe but a trembling Quicksand*, as N. O. ſpeaks in his Preface; only from the ſuppoſing *an errability in the Guides of Gods Church*. And a little after he lays down that as his fundamental Principle, *that the only certain way not to be miſled, will be the ſubmitting our internal aſſent and belief to Church Authority*; or as he elſewhere ſpeaks, *to the infallible Guideſhip of Church Governors*. P. 17. Here then two Queſtions neceſſarily ariſe: 1. Whether there can be no certainty of Faith without this infallibility? 2. What certainty there is of this infallibility?

1. Whether there can be no certainty of Faith without *Infallibility* in the Guides of the Church, and ſubmitting our internal aſſent and belief to them? For the clearing of this we muſt conſider what things are agreed upon between us, that by them we may

proceed to the resolution of this Question.

1. It is I suppose agreed, That every man hath in him a faculty of discerning of truth and falshood.

2. That this Faculty must be used at least in the choice of the infallible Guide; for otherwise a man must be abused with every pretence of Infallibility, and *George Fox* may as well be followed as the Pope of *Rome*; and to what purpose are all prudential motives and arguments for Infallibility, if a man must not judge whether they be good or no, *i.e.* sufficient to prove the thing?

3. That God is not wanting in necessaries to the salvation of mankind.

4. That the Books of Scripture received on both sides do contain in them the Will of God in order to salvation.

5. That all things simply necessary to salvation are contained therein, which is a concession mentioned before.

§. 5. *N.O's. exceptions answer'd.* These things being supposed, the Question now is, Whether a person not relying on the infallibility of a Church, may not be certain of those things which are contained in those Books in order to Salvation? For of those our present enquiry is, and not about the sense of the more difficult and controverted places; and if we can make it appear that men may be certain

tain as to matters of ſalvation without infallibility, let them prove (if they can) the neceſſity of infallibility for things which are not neceſſary to ſalvation. But of the ſenſe of *Scripture* in thoſe things afterwards; I now enquire into the certainty men may attain to, of *the neceſſaries to ſalvation in Scripture:* and concerning this, I laid down this Propoſition.

Although we cannot argue againſt any particular way of Revelation from the neceſſary Attributes of God, yet ſuch a way as writing being made choice of by him, we may juſtly ſay, that it is repugnant to the nature of the deſign and the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God to give infallible aſſiſtance to perſons in writing his Will for the benefit of Mankind, if thoſe Writings may not be underſtood by all perſons who ſincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them in all ſuch things as are neceſſary for their ſalvation. Prop. 13.

This Principle, he ſaith, *is unſound*; which, if he can prove, I may have more reaſon to queſtion it than I yet have. And I aſſure him I expect no mean proofs to ſhake my belief of a principle of ſo great importance to the Chriſtian Religion. For it being granted by him, *that all things ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation, are contained in the Books of Scripture*, I deſire to know whether *things ſimply neceſſary* P. 13.

ought not to be delivered with greater plainneſs than things which are not ſo? Whether God appointing the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles to write theſe things, did not intend that they ſhould be ſo expreſſed as they might moſt eaſily be underſtood? Whether our Saviours own Sermons were capable of being underſtood by thoſe who heard them, without ſome infallible Interpreter? Whether the Evangeliſts did not faithfully deliver our Saviours Doctrine? If they did, how that comes to be obſcure now; which was plain then? ſo that either Chriſt himſelf muſt be charged with not ſpeaking the Will of God plainly, or the Evangeliſts cannot be charged with not expreſſing it ſo. There are no other Books in the World that I know of, that need an infallible Interpreter: and we can tell certainly enough what any other Religion requires, ſuppoſing it to be written in the ſame way that the Chriſtian is: Is it not poſſible for a man to be certain what the Law of Moſes required of the People of *Iſrael*, by reading the Books of that Law, without ſome infallible Guides? Do the ten Commandments need an *Infallible Comment*? Or can we have now no certainty of the meaning of the *Levitical Law*, becauſe there is no High-prieſt or Sanhedrin to explain it? And if it be poſſible to underſtand the neceſſaries of that dark diſpenſation in com pari-

ſon

ſon with the Goſpel, are our eyes now blinded with too much light? Is not Chriſtianity therefore highly recommended to us in the New Teſtament, becauſe of the clearneſs and perſpicuity wherein the Doctrines and Precepts thereof are delivered? And yet after all this, cannot the moſt neceſſary parts of it, be underſtood by thoſe who ſincerely endeavour to underſtand them? By which ſincere endeavour we are ſo far from excluding any uſeful helps, that we always ſuppoſe them. The ſum then of what he is to confute, is this, that although the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts did deliver the Mind of God to the World in their Writings, in order to the ſalvation of Mankind, although they were inſpired by an infinite Wiſdom for this end, although all things ſimply neceſſary to Salvation are contained in their Writings, although a Perſon uſeth his ſincere endeavour by all Moral helps, and the Divine Grace aſſiſting him to find out in theſe Writings the things neceſſary to Salvation, yet after all he cannot certainly underſtand the meaning of them. Which to me appears ſo abſurd and monſtrous a Doctrine, ſo contrary to the honour of the Scriptures and the deſign of Chriſtianity, that if I had a mind to diſparage it, I would begin with this, and end with Tranſubſtantiation. For in earneſt Sir, did not our Saviour ſpeak intelligibly in matters of

ſo great importance to the Salvation of Mankind? Did he not declare all that was neceſſary for that end, in his many admirable diſcourſes? Did not the Evangeliſts record his words and actions in writing, and that as one of them ſaith expreſly, Joh. 20, 31. *That we might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and that believing we might have life through his name?* And after all this, cannot we underſtand ſo much as the common neceſſaries to ſalvation by the greateſt and moſt ſincere endeavour for that end? But it is time now to conſider his exceptions againſt this Principle: which are theſe.

P. 13. 1. *That God may reveal his mind ſo in Scripture as that in many things it may be clear only to ſome perſons more verſed in the Scriptures, and in the Churches Traditional ſenſe of them, and more aſſiſted from above according to their imployment; which perſons he hath appointed to inſtruct the reſt.* But what is all this to our purpoſe? our Queſtion is not about *may be's*, and poſſibilities of things, but it is taken for granted on both ſides, that God hath revealed his mind in writing; therefore he need not make the ſuppoſition of *no writings at all*, as he doth afterwards: the Queſtion is, Whether theſe Writings being allowed

P. 14.

lowed for divine revelations of the Will of God, he hath expreſſed the neceſſaries to ſalvation clearly therein or not? That God may deliver his mind obſcurely in many things, is no queſtion; nor that he may inſpire perſons to unfold his mind, where it is obſcure; but our queſtion is, whether or no theſe Writings being acknowledged to contain the Will of God, it be agreeable with the nature of the deſign and the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God for ſuch Writings not to be capable of being underſtood in all things neceſſary to ſalvation, by thoſe who ſincerely endeavour to underſtand them? But when I had expreſly ſaid, *things neceſſary for ſalvation*, why doth he avoid that which the diſpute was about, and only ſay *many things* inſtead of it? I do not doubt but there are many difficult places of Scripture, as there muſt be in any ancient Writings penned in an Idiom ſo very different from ours. But I never yet ſaw one difficulty removed by the pretended Infallible Guides of the Church; all the help we have had, hath been from meer fallible men of excellent skill in Languages, Hiſtory, and Chronology, and of a clear underſtanding; and we ſhould be very unthankful not to acknowledge the great helps we have had from them, for underſtanding the difficult places of Scripture: But for the *Infallible Guides*, they have dealt by the obſcu-

rities

rities of Scripture, *as the Prieſt and the Levite* in our Saviours Parable, did by the *wounded man*, they *have fairly paſſed them by*, and taken no care of them. If theſe Guides did believe themſelves infallible, they have made the leaſt uſe of their Talent that ever men did; they have laid it up in a Napkin, and buried it in the earth, for nothing of it ever appeared above ground. How could they have obliged the World more, (nay, it had been neceſſary to have done it for the uſe of their Gift) than to have given an Infallible ſenſe of all controverted Places; and then there had been but one diſpute left, whether they were infallible or not? but now, ſuppoſing we believe their Infallibility, we are ſtill as far to ſeek, for the meaning of many difficult places. And ſuppoſing God had once beſtowed this Gift of Infallibility upon the Guides of the Church, he might moſt juſtly deprive them of it, becauſe of the no uſe they have made of it; and we might have great reaſon to believe ſo from our Saviours words, *To him that hath ſhall be given, but from him that hath not, ſhall be taken away even that which he hath.* So that not making uſe of this Talent of Infallibility, gives us juſt reaſon to queſtion, whether God continues it, ſuppoſing he had once given it to the Guides of the Church, ſince the Apoſtles days: which I ſee no reaſon to believe.

Luke 10. 31, 32.

Mat. 25. 29.

2. His

2. His next exception is from a ſaying of Dr. *Fields*, *who*, he ſaith, *ſeems to advance a contrary Principle in his Preface to his Books of the Church.* But O the miſchief of Common-place-Books! which make men write what they find, and not what is to their purpoſe. For after all, Dr. *Field* doth but ſeem to advance another Principle in his opinion, and doth not ſo much as ſeem to do it in mine. For that learned and judicious Writer ſets himſelf purpoſely to diſprove the Infallibility of the Church in the beginning of his fourth Book; and is it probable that any man of common underſtanding would aſſert that in his Preface, which he had diſproved in his Book? It is a known diſtinction in the *Church* of *Rome* of the Church Virtual, repreſentative and eſſential; by the two firſt are meant Popes and Councils; and of theſe two, Dr. *Field* ſaith, *that they may erre in matters of greateſt Conſequence*; yet theſe are *N. O's.* infallible Guides, whoſe conduct he ſuppoſeth men obliged to follow, and to yield their internal aſſent to. Concerning the eſſential Church, he ſaith, *That it either comprehends all the faithful that are and have been ſince Chriſt appeared in the fleſh; and then*, he ſaith, *it is abſolutely free from all errour and ignorance of divine things, that are to be known by Revelation; or as it comprehends only*

P. 14.

Field of the Church *l.* 4. *ch* 5. *p.* 350.

Ch. 2.

only all those Believers that are and have been since the Apostles times; and in this sense, he saith, *the whole Church may be ignorant in sundry things, which are not necessary to salvation; but he thinks it impossible for the whole Church to erre in any thing of this nature. But in things that cannot be clearly deduced from the Rule of Faith, and word of divine and heavenly Truth, we think it possible, that all that have written of such things might erre and be deceived. But if the Church be taken only as it comprehends the Believers that now are, and presently live in the world,* he saith, *it is certain and agreed upon, that in things necessary to be known and believed expressly and distinctly, it never is ignorant, much less doth erre. Yea in things that are not absolutely necessary to be known and believed expressly and distinctly, we constantly believe that this Church can never erre, nor doubt pertinaciously, but that there shall ever be some found ready to embrace the truth, if it be manifested to them, and such as shall not wholly neglect the search and enquiry after it, as times and means give leave.* But if we mean by a Church, any particular *Church*, he determines,

Ch. 5. *That particular men and Churches may erre damnably, because notwithstanding others may worship God aright; but that the whole Church at one time cannot so erre, for that*

then the Church ſhould ceaſe utterly for a time, and ſo not be Catholick being not at all times; and Chriſt ſhould ſometimes be without a Church; yet, that errors not prejudicing the ſalvation of them that erre may be found in the Church, that is at one time in the world, we make no doubt; only the Symbolical and Catholick which is and was being wholly free from error. Which ſeveral expreſſions amount to no more than this, that there will be always ſome true Chriſtians in the World; but what is this to infallible Teachers and Guides, in a Church that pretends to be Catholick againſt all the ſenſe and reaſon in the World? And is it now imaginable after all this, that Dr. *Field* ſhould make any particular Church infallible? No, all that he means in his Preface, is this, that *among all the Societies of men, perſons who have not leiſure or capacity to examine particular Controverſies, ought diligently to ſearch which is the true Church, and having done this, to embrace her communion, follow her directions, and reſt in her judgment, i.e.* Suppoſe a man by that very Book of Dr. *Fields* ſhould be convinced that the *Church* of *Rome* is a very corrupt and tyrannical Church, and the *Church* of *England* is a ſound and good Church (which was the deſign of his writing it,) he being thus far ſatisfied, ought *to embrace the communion of this*

this Church, and ſo follow her directions, and reſt in her judgment, ſo, as not to forſake her communion for any cavils that are raiſed about particular Controverſies of which he is not a capable judge. And doth this make the *Church* of *England* infallible? If we ſay that a man being firſt ſatisfied of the skill and integrity of a Lawyer, ought to follow his directions, and *reſt in his judgment*; doth this make that Lawyer *infallible?* ſo we ſay here, the *reſting in the judgment of a Church*, of whoſe integrity we have aſſurance beforehand, implies only the ſuppoſition of ſo much honeſty and skill in a Church, as may overrule the Judgments of perſons who either have not leiſure or capacity to underſtand particular Controverſies which require skill in Languages, ſearch into the Fathers and later Writers on both ſides. If we ſay, that unlearned perſons ought in ſuch things to truſt the learned, whoſe integrity they have no ground to ſuſpect, this doth not certainly make the more learned infallible? But we may reſt in the judgment of thoſe whom we have no reaſon to ſuſpect, though we believe them not to be infallible: and it was the former Dr. *Field* meant, and by no means any infallibility, unleſs he plainly contradict himſelf.

P. 15. 3. He excepts, *That this brings in an inerrability of every particular Chriſtian in all points*

points neceſſary, if ſuch Chriſtians will, that is, if only they ſhall ſincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them. The force of this Argument will be eaſily diſcerned if we put another parallel to it, *viz.* That they who aſſert from Scripture the aſſiſtance of Divine Grace to the ſincere endeavours of men, do make all men impeccable *if they will*; as well as thoſe who aſſert, that God will not be wanting in neceſſaries to ſalvation to thoſe who ſincerely endeavour to know them, make all ſuch men ſo far infallible, if they will. If any one thing be plain in Scripture, the goodneſs of God is; and who can believe that, and yet think that he will ſuffer thoſe who ſincerely endeavour to know what is neceſſary to their ſalvation, not to underſtand it? But beſides, how often doth the Scripture promiſe a greater degree of knowledge *to the meek and humble, to the diligent and induſtrious; to thoſe that ask and ſeek wiſdom from him, to thoſe that do the will of God*, to whom our Saviour hath expreſly promiſed, *that they ſhall know of his doctrine, whether it be of God or no?* And if this be the *inerrability* he means, he ſees what grounds we have to aſſert it. But we underſtand not by it, that ſuch perſons cannot erre in their judgments about what things are neceſſary, and what not; nor that they cannot erre in other things which are not ſo neceſſary

Pſal. 25. 9. James 1. 5. Luke 11. 13.

John 7. 17.

to

to ſalvation; but that Gods goodneſs is ſo great, and his promiſes ſo plain, and his word ſo clear in neceſſary things, that no one who ſincerely endeavours to know them, ſhall ever miſs of ſalvation. And if ſuch an infallibility will ſatisfie them, we do not deny it to Popes themſelves, or other Guides of the Church, on condition they do not think themſelves infallible beyond theſe bounds; for they are only the *meek* and *humble* whom God hath promiſed *to teach his way*, and not ſuch who will be infallible whether God will or no.

His other exceptions from *this principle deſtroying Church-Authority*, *from the parity of reaſon for Church Governors*, *and the controverted places of Scripture* ſhall be conſidered afterwards.

§. 6. N. O's. Proofs of Infallibility examined.

2. I now come to examine what certainty there is for this Infallibility? Here I ſhall lay down ſome principles of common reaſon, by which we may better underſtand the force of his arguments.

1. That the Proof ought always to be more evident than the thing that is to be proved by it. For otherwiſe it is of no advantage to the proof of it, if it have but the ſame degree of evidence; but is a great prejudice to it, if it have leſs: ſo that if the proofs of Infallibility be equally obſcure and difficult with thoſe

those things which are to be believed by virtue of it, this Infallibility is of no use; but if they be less evident, the pretence of it is both very ridiculous and prejudicial to the Christian Faith.

2. The greater concernment any Law is of, and the greater danger in mistaking the meaning of it, the more plain and distinct ought the terms of that Law to be. As a Law about the succession of the Crown ought to be framed with all the clearness and distinctness imaginable, because the peace and security of a Nation depends upon it. So in case Christ hath appointed any Successor in the Government of his Church; or entailed Infallibility upon the Guides of it: this being a matter of such infinite concernment to the whole Church; it is most unreasonable to conceive that whatever other parts of his Will were obscure, those which relate to the matter of Succession and Infallibility, should be so; but rather so plain, that no one can miss of understanding them, because the weight of all the rest depends upon these two; and it is so horrible a presumption in any to pretend to them, in case they have no right to them, and the danger so great in relying upon them if there be no such thing.

3. A Law of such universal concernment to the Faith and Peace of the Christian Church

being ſuppoſed, the practice of the beſt and pureſt Ages of the Church muſt be ſuppoſed agreeable thereto, *i. e.* that in all matters of difference they did conſtantly own theſe infallible Judges, by appealing to them for a final iſſue of all debates, and reſting ſatisfied with their deciſions. But if on the contrary, when great differences have happened in and neareſt the firſt times, no ſuch Authority was made uſe of, but other ways put in practice to make an end of them; if when it was pretended, it was ſlighted and rejected; nay, if the perſons pretending it, were proceeded againſt and condemned, and this not by a popular Faction, but by juſt and legal Authority; we may thence conclude that ſuch Judges have arrogated that power to themſelves, which was not given them by the Supreme Legiſlator. Theſe things being premiſed, I come to his particular Arguments, which lie ſcattered up and down; but to give them the greater ſtrength, I ſhall bring them nearer together. And they are drawn either from *Scripture*, or *Tradition*, or *parity of Reaſon*.

1. *From Scripture.* And in truth the only ſatisfactory Argument in a matter of ſo great concernment to the Chriſtian Church, ought only to be drawn from thence, unleſs we will ſuppoſe the Scripture defective in the moſt important things. For this being pleaded as a thing

thing neceſſary for the Peace of the Church by ſome, and for the Faith of Chriſtians by others; ſo much greater the neceſſity of it is, ſo much clearer ought the evidence of it to be in Scripture, ſuppoſing that to be intended to reveal the Will of God to us in matters of the greateſt neceſſity. But it cannot be denied by our Adverſaries, that the places produced by them for a conſtant Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, do not neceſſarily prove it; becauſe they are very capable of being underſtood, as to the Infallibility only of the Apoſtles in the firſt Age and Foundation of the Chriſtian Church: is it then to be imagined that if Chriſt had intended ſuch an Infallibility as the foundation of the Faith and Peace of his Church, he would not have delivered his mind more plainly and clearly than he is pretended to do in this matter? How eaſily might all the contentions of the Chriſtian World have been prevented, if Chriſt had cauſed it to be delivered in terms ſo clear, as the nature of the thing doth require? If he had ſaid, *I do promiſe my Infallible Spirit to the Guides of the Church in all Ages, to give the true ſenſe of Scripture in all controverſies which ſhall ariſe among Chriſtians, and I expect an obedience ſuitably to all their determinations:* or, more particularly, *I appoint the Biſhops of Rome in all Ages for my Succeſſors in*

the Government of the Church, who ſhall be the ſtanding and infallible Judges of all Controverſies among Chriſtians; this diſpute might never have happened among us. For we aſſure them that we account the peace of the Church ſo valuable a thing, and obedience to Chriſts Commands ſo neceſſary a duty, that we are well enough inclined to embrace the doctrine of Infallibility, if we could ſee any ground in Scripture for it. But we cannot make perſons infallible by believing them to be ſo, but we may eaſily make our ſelves fools, as others have done, by believing it without reaſon. The controverſie then is not, whether Infallibility in the Guides of the Church be a deſirable thing or not, for ſo we ſay impeccability is too; but the queſtion is, whether there be any ſuch thing promiſed by Chriſt to the Guides of his Church, and whether all Chriſtians on that account are bound to yield their internal aſſent, as well as external obedience to all their decrees? which we deny, and deſire to ſee it clearly proved from his words who alone could grant this Infallibility.

For if an infallible Judge be therefore neceſſary, becauſe the Scripture is not ſufficiently clear for the ending of Controverſies, and that God hath actually conſtituted ſuch a Judge, cannot be proved but by Scripture, ſurely we have

have all the reaſon in the World to expect that the Scripture ſhould be abundantly, and beyond all contradiction clear in this point, to make amends for its obſcurity in the reſt: For if this Point be not clearly proved, we are never the nearer an end of Controverſies: becauſe the buſineſs ſtops at the very head, and they may beg their hearts out, before we ſhall ever be ſo good natured as to grant it them without proof. And they who have been ſo bold (ſhall I ſay? or blaſphemous) as to charge our Lord with *want of diſcretion*, in caſe he have not provided his Church with ſuch an Infallible Judge, do certainly render him much more obnoxious to this imputation, in ſuppoſing him to have conſtituted ſuch a Judge, if he have no where plainly declared that he hath done ſo. And let them, if they can, produce one clear Text of Scripture to this purpoſe, which by the unanimous conſent of the Fathers is ſo interpreted; and which, to the common ſenſe of Mankind, is more ſufficiently clear for the ending this Controverſie, than the Scripture is ſaid by them to be in other neceſſary Points of Faith. And till they have done this, according to their own way of arguing, we have as much reaſon to deny their Infallibility, as they have to demand our aſſent to it, upon the preſumed obſcurity and inſufficiency of Scripture.

§ 7. Of the Arguments from Scripture for Infallibility.

When I came thus prepared to find what the Conſiderator would produce in a matter of ſuch conſequence, I ſoon diſcerned how little mind he had to inſiſt upon any proofs of that, which is his only Engine to overthrow my Principles. For after the moſt diligent ſearch I could make, the only Argument from *Scripture* I found produced, was from the Old Teſtament, (where I confeſs I leaſt looked for it) but however, this is thought ſo conſiderable as to be twice produced; and yet is ſo unlucky, that if I underſtand any thing of the force of it, it proves the Judges in *Weſtminſter* Hall to be infallible, rather than the Pope, or any Guide of the Chriſtian Church. For the force of the Argument lies in *Gods appointing Judges under the Law, according to whoſe ſentence matters were to be determined, upon penalty of death in caſe of diſobedience.* But what then? doth this imply Infallibility? no, that he dares not ſtand to, but abſolute obedience, which we are ready to yield when we ſee the like abſolute command for Eccleſiaſtical Judges of Controverſies of Religion, as there was among the *Jews* for their ſupreme *Judges* in matters of Law. But of this place I have already ſpoken at large, and ſhewed how impertinently it is produced for Infallibility in the Book, he often referrs to, and might, if he had thought fit, have anſwered what is there ſaid,

P. 11. 25. 26.

Deut. 17. 10. 11, 12. 2 *Chron.* 19 10.

Ration. Account. p. 1. *ch.* 8. *Sect.* 2. *p.* 239.

ſaid before he had urged it again, without any new ſtrength added to it.

But ſince he produces no other proof for it, I muſt conſider how he goes about to weaken mine againſt it. Two things I inſiſted upon againſt ſuch a pretence of Infallibility, *viz.* That ſuch a pretence implying an infallible Aſſiſtance of the Spirit of God, there were but two ways of proving it, either, 1. By ſuch miracles as the Apoſtles wrought to atteſt their infallibility, or 2. By thoſe *Scriptures* from whence this Infallibility is derived. Concerning both theſe I laid down two Propoſitions.

1. Concerning the Proof by *miracles*. The Propoſition was this.

There can be no more intollerable uſurpation on the Faith of Chriſtians than for any Perſon or Society of men to pretend to an Aſſiſtance as Infallible in what they propoſe, as was in Chriſt or his Apoſtles, without giving an equal degree of evidence that they are ſo aſſiſted as Chriſt and his Apoſtles did, *viz.* by miracles as great, publick, and convincing as theirs were; by which I mean ſuch as are wrought by thoſe very perſons who challenge this Infallibility, and with a deſign for the conviction of thoſe who do not believe it. Prop. 16.

To this he anſwers: 1. *That I am equally obliged to produce miracles for the Churches Infallibility in Fundamentals, which I had* P. 27.

asserted in the defence of the Archbishop. But this admits a very easie answer; for when I speak of Infallibility in Fundamentals, I there declare that I mean no more by it, than that there shall be always a number of true Christians in the World. And what necessity is there now of miracles for men to believe, since they receive the doctrine of the Gospel upon those miracles by which it was at first attested. Neither is there any need of miracles to shew that any number of men are not guilty of an actual errour in what they believe, supposing they declare to believe only on the account of that divine Revelation which is owned by Christians; for in this case the trial of doctrine is to be by Scripture. But in case any persons challenge an Infallibility to themselves antecedently to the belief of Scriptures, and by vertue of which, they say, men must believe the Scriptures, then I say such persons are equally bound to prove their infallibility by miracles as the Apostles were.

2. Not resting in this, he proceeds to another answer, the sum of which is, *That the Infallibility of the Church not being so large or so high as the Apostles, but consisting only in the Infallible delivery of the same doctrine, there is no necessity of miracles in the present Church.* To this I answer, That the doctrine of the Gospel may be said to be new two ways;

P. 28, 29.

1. In

1. In respect of the matter contained in it, and so it was new only when it was first revealed. 2. In respect of the person who is to believe it: so it is new in every age to those who are first brought to believe it. Now the Apostles had their infallibility attested by miracles, not barely with a respect to the revelation of new matter, for then none would have needed miracles but Christ himself, or the Apostles that made the first Sermons; for afterwards the matter was not new, but the necessity of miracles was to give a sufficient motive to believe, to all those to whom the Gospel was proposed; and therefore miracles are said to be a *sign to unbelievers*. For by these, Unbelievers were convinced that there was sufficient ground for receiving the doctrine of the Gospel on the Authority of those who delivered it; *God himself bearing them witness with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost*. Suppose then, any of the Apostles after their first preaching continued only to inculcate the same doctrine for the conversion of more Unbelievers; in this case the evidence of miracles was the reason of relying on the Authority of those persons for the truth of the Doctrine delivered by them. From whence it follows, that where the Christian Faith is to be received on the Authority of any persons in any Age, those persons ought

1 Cor. 14. 22.

Heb. 2. 4.

ought to confirm that Authority by miracles, as the Apoſtles did. For without this, there can be no ſuch Authority whereon to rely, antecedently to the embracing the Chriſtian Faith. Now, this is the caſe of the Church of *Rome* they pretend not to deliver any Doctrine wholly new, but what was one way or another delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles; (although we therein charge them with fraud and falſhood) but yielding this, yet they contend that no man can have ſufficient ground for believing the Word of God, but from their Churches Infallibility; in this caſe it is plain that they make their Churches Infallibility to be as much the reaſon of perſons believing, as the Infallibility of the Apoſtles in their time was; and therefore I ſay, they ought to prove this Infallibility in the ſame way, and by miracles, as great, publick, and convincing, as the Apoſtles did. 3. Yet he is very loath to let go the miracles of their Church, done in later times as well as formerly. It would be too large a task in this place to examine the miracles of the *Roman* Church, (that may be better done on another occaſion,) all that I have here to ſay is, that all the miracles pretended among them, ſignifie nothing to our preſent purpoſe, unleſs thoſe miracles give evidence of the Authority and Infallibility of thoſe by whom they were done;

P. 29.

done; and they would do well to ſhew, where ever in Scripture God did beſtow a gift of miracles upon any but for this end: and what reaſon there is that God ſhould alter the method and courſe of his providence, in a matter of ſo great concernment to the Faith of Mankind. Such miracles as were wrought by Chriſt and his Apoſtles we defie all other Religions in the World to produce any like them to confirm their Doctrine; but ſuch as the Church of *Rome* pretends, ſcarce any Religion in the World but hath pretended to the ſame. And *for his moſt credible Hiſtories* he vouches for them, I hope he doth not mean *the Church Hiſtory written by S. C.* nor any other ſuch *Legends* among them; if he doth, I aſſure him they have a very eaſie Faith that think them credible. And if *all miracles* that are ſo called, by thoſe among whom they are done, *be an Argument*, as he ſaith, *of the ſecurity of ſalvation in the Communion and Faith of that Church wherein they are done*, I hope he will be ſo juſt, to allow the ſame to the *Arrians*, *Novatians*, *Donatiſts*, and others, who all pretend to *miracles* as well as the *Church of Rome*, as any one that is verſed in *Church-Hiſtory* may eaſily ſee. But of this more at large elſewhere. P 30.

2. Concerning the proof of *Infallibility* from *Scripture*, I laid down this Propoſition.

No-

Prop. 17. Nothing can be more abſurd, than to pretend the neceſſity of ſuch an infallible commiſſion and aſſiſtance to aſſure us of the truth of thoſe Writings, and to interpret them; and at the ſame time to prove that Commiſſion from thoſe Writings from which we are told, nothing can be certainly deduced, ſuch an Aſſiſtance not being ſuppoſed; or to pretend that Infallibility in a Body of men, is not as liable to doubts and diſputes, as in thoſe Books from whence only they derive their Infallibility.

P. 37. He grants the former part of this, *if by it be intended to prove ſuch Commiſſion only, or in the firſt place from theſe writings. But*, he ſaith, *a Chriſtians Faith may begin either at the Infallible authority of Scriptures, or of the Church:* It ſeems then, there may be ſufficient ground for a Chriſtians Faith, as to the Scriptures, without believing any thing of the Churches Infallibility; and for this we have reaſon to thank him, whatever they of his own Church think of it. For, by this conceſſion we may believe the Scriptures Authority, without ever believing a word of the Churches Infallibility; and let them afterwards prove it from *Scripture* if they can. Nay he goes yet farther, and ſaith, *That the Infallibility of Scriptures as well as the Church may be proved from its own teſtimony:* but he firſt

first ſuppoſes, that the Infallibility of one of theſe, be firſt learnt from *Tradition*. And therefore in the remainder of his diſcourſe on this Subject, he ſhews *how the Infallibility of the Church may be proved from Tradition*. not ſhewing at all how the *Infallibility* of the *Church* can be proved from *Scripture*.

§. 8. Of the Argument from Tradition for Infallibility. P. 38,39.

Scripture being thus deſerted, as to the proof of the Churches Infallibility, I muſt purſue him to his other Hold of Tradition. The method of his diſcourſe is this; *That the Infallibility of the Guides of the Church was antecedent to the Scriptures*; *That the Apoſtles did not loſe their infallibility by committing what they preached to writing*; *That their ſucceſſors were to have this infallibility preſerved in them, if there had been no writings*; *and cannot be imagined to have loſt it becauſe of them, becauſe theſe give teſtimony to it*; *That this Infallibility is preſerved by Tradition deſcending from Age to Age, as we ſay the Canon of Scripture is delivered to us*; *And laſtly, That the Governours of the Church always held and reputed themſelves infallible, appears by their Anathematizing diſſenters*. In this Diſcourſe there are ſome things ſuppoſed without reaſon, and other things aſſerted without proof. The Foundation of all this Diſcourſe proceeds upon the ſuppoſition that the ſame Infallibility which was in the Apoſtles, muſt be

be continued in their Succeſſors through all Ages of the Church, for which I ſee not the leaſt ſhadow of reaſon produced. *Yes*, ſaith he, *ſuppoſing there had been no Writings, and no Infallibility, Chriſtian Religion would have been no rational and well grounded, no ſtable and certain Religion.* Two things in anſwer to this, I deſire to be informed of: 1. What he thinks of the Religion of the *Patriarchs*, who received their Religion by Tradition, without any ſuch Infallibility? 2. What he thinks of thoſe Chriſtians who receive the Scriptures or Churches Infallibility by vertue of common and univerſal Tradition (which is certainly the ground of the one, and ſuppoſed by him to be of the other) whether the Faith of ſuch perſons be rational and well-grounded, ſtable, and certain, or not; if it be, then there is no ſuch neceſſity of Infallibility for that purpoſe; if it be not, then he doth hereby declare that the Faith of Chriſtians is *irrational* and ill-grounded. For whatſoever is received on the account of Tradition antecedent to the belief of Infallibility, cannot be received on the account of it; but the belief of either Scriptures or Churches Infallibility, muſt be firſt received by vertue of a principle antecedent to the Scriptures or Churches Infallibility, *viz.* Tradition. By this it appears, that his very way of proving, deſtroys the thing he would

prove

prove by it: For if the Tradition may be a ſufficient ground of Faith, how comes Infallibility to be neceſſary? But if this Infallibility be not neceſſary without the Scriptures, much leſs certainly is it now, ſince it is acknowledged on both ſides, that the Apoſtles were infallible in their Writings, and that therein the Will of God is contained as to all things ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation. *But theſe ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles were not deprived of their infallibility by the Apoſtles Writings*; No certainly, for none can be deprived of what they never had; but where are the reaſons all this while, to ſhew that there was the ſame neceſſity of Infallibility in the Apoſtles ſucceſſors, as was in them? Two I find rather intimated than inſiſted upon. 1. *That the Church would otherwiſe have failed, if there had been neither Writings nor Infallibility*; But if this Argument hold for any thing, it is for the neceſſity of the Scriptures, and not of Infallibility; for we ſee God did furniſh the Church with one, and left no footſteps of the other. We do not diſpute how far the Church might have been preſerved without the Scriptures, we find it hath been hard enough to preſerve it pure with them: but we always acknowledge the Infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God, that hath not left us in matters of Faith and Salvation to the determinations of

men

men liable to be corrupted by Intereſt and Ambition, but hath appointed men inſpired by himſelf to ſet down whatever is neceſſary for us to believe and practiſe. And upon theſe Writings we fix our Faith, as on a firm and unmovable Rock; and on the veracity of God therein contained and expreſſed, we build all our hopes of a Bleſſed Eternity. And one great benefit more we have by theſe divine Books, that by them we can ſo eaſily diſcover the fraud and impoſture of the confident Pretenders to Infallibility. Which is the true reaſon why the Patrons of the Church of *Romes* Infallibility have ſo little kindneſs for the Scriptures, and take all occaſions to diſparage them, by inſinuating that they are good for nothing but to breed Hereſies in the Heads of the People; upon pretence of which danger, they hide this Candle under a Buſhel, leſt it ſhould give too much light to them that are in the Houſe, and diſcover ſome things which it is more convenient to keep in the dark.

2. He ſaith, ***The Infallibility of the Apoſtles ſucceſſors, receives a ſecond evidence from the teſtimony thereof found alſo in theſe Writings.*** I confeſs I have ſeen nothing like the *firſt* evidence yet, to which this ſhould be a *ſecond*; but if by the *firſt* be meant that which I mentioned before, this is a proper *ſecond* for it. Neither of them, I dare ſay, intend any miſ-

miſchief to any body; both firſt and ſecond are forced into the Field, where they ſtand only for dumb ſhews, and wonder what they are brought for. But whereabouts I pray doth this *ſecond Teſtimony* ſtand? what are its weapons? I hope not *Dic Eccleſiæ*, nor *Dabo tibi Claves*, nor any of the old ruſty Armour which our modern Combatants begin to be aſhamed to appear with in the Field. And to ſpeak truth, *N. O.* ſeems to underſtand his Art better than to meddle with ſuch heavy and Antique Armour, which every one hath been foiled with that hath undertaken to combat with them; only it ſeems a little for the credit of their Cauſe to point to ſuch a Magazine, which in the days of Ignorance and Credulity, the Romantick Age of the Church, was in great requeſt. But we muſt now buckle our ſelves to a new manner of Combat, which is from the Tradition of the Church, and that of the very ſame nature with what we have for the *Canon* of *Scripture*. This I confeſs is bright ſhining Armour, and may do great ſervice if it will hold; but that muſt be judged upon trial, which I now ſet my ſelf to. But we ſhall find that no weapons formed againſt Truth can proſper: and it hath been long obſerved of *Rome* that it could never endure a cloſe Siege.

The Queſtion now is, whether they of the *Roman* Church have the ſame univerſal Tra-

dition for the Infallibility of the Guides of it, wch we have for the Canon of Scripture? wch he asserts. It is I suppose agreed on both sides, That the Tradition on wch we receive and believe the Scriptures to be the Word of God was universal as to all Ages and Times of the Church; that from the beginning all disputes in Religion among true Christians, were built upon the supposition of it; That in no Age any persons were allowed to be good Christians who made doubt of it; That every Age doth afford plentiful testimonies of the belief of it. This is that universal Tradition we receive the Scriptures upon; and let any thing like this be produced for the Infallibility of the Guides of their Church, and we yield up the Cause to them. Can any fairer terms than these be desired? But we expect proofs, and so I perceive we may do to the Worlds end. I commend the Ingenuity of *N. O.* for endeavouring to escape out of the circle any way; but I believe they think themselves as wise, who still dance within it, knowing the impossibility of doing any good in this other way. The only Argument he insists upon is so weak, that I wonder he had not considered how often it had been answered by their own Writers. For it is certain that Provincial Councils as well as General, have *Anathematized dissenters, and pronounced them Hereticks*, which is his only Argument

to

to prove this Tradition of the Churches Infallibility; and they had no way to answer it, but by saying, this doth not imply their Infallibility. And if it doth not in the case of Provincial Councils; why should he think it doth in the case of General? For the *Anathema's* of *Provincial Councils* did not relate to the acceptation of their Decrees, either by the Pope, or the whole Church, as *N. O* supposes, but did proceed upon their own assurance of the truth of what they decreed; otherwise their *Anathema's* would have been only conditional, and not absolute and peremptory as we see they were. But I need give no other answer to this Argument than in the words of Dr. *Field* whom *N.O.* appealed to before, *viz.* ***That Councils denounce Anathema not because they think every one that disobeyeth the Decree of the Council to be accursed, but because they are perswaded in particular, that this is the eternal truth of God which they propose, therefore they accurse them that obstinately shall resist, as St.*** Paul ***willeth every Christian man to Anathematize an Angel coming from Heaven, if he shall teach him any other doctrine than he hath already learned: yet is not every particular Christian free from possibility of erring.*** If the Argument then were good from Anathematizing dissenters, and calling them Hereticks, every particular person must by it

Bell de Concil. l.2. c.10.

Field of the Church, *l.4 c.4.*

be proved Infallible; who are bound to Anathematize even Angels from Heaven in case of delivering any other doctrine from the Gospel; so that this, which is his only Argument in stead of proving an universal Tradition would prove an universal Infallibility.

Let the Reader now judge in his Conscience, whether here be any thing offered in the way of Tradition for the Churches Infallibility, that may bear the least proportion with the Tradition on which we receive the Scriptures? And yet if this had been true, it had been almost impossible that any one Age should have passed without remarkable testimonies of it. For no Age of the Church hath been so happy as not to have occasion for an Infallible Judge of Controversies, if any such had been appointed by Christ: and therefore it cannot be imagined, but that Christians must in all Controversies arising have appealed to him, and stood to his determinations; which must have been as well known in the practice of the Church, as Judges trying Causes in *Westminster* Hall. But I challenge him to produce any one Age since the Apostles times to this day, wherein the Infallibility of a standing Judge of Controversies appointed by Christ, hath been received by as universal a consent as the Authority of Scripture hath been in that very Age. Nay, I except not

that

that Age which hath been ſince the Council of *Trent*; for the Scriptures of the New Teſtament have been received of all ſides, but the Infallibility of a ſtanding Judge is utterly denied by one ſide, and vehemently diſputed between ſeveral parties on the other. Some making only the Eſſential Church infallible, others the repreſentative in Councils, others again the virtual, *viz.* the Pope. And ſuppoſing any infallible Judge neceſſary; it ſtands to reaſon it ſhould be rather in one than in a multitude, and rather in a conſtant ſucceſſion of Biſhops in one See, than in an uncertain number who cannot be convened together as often as the neceſſities of the Church may require. But this is ſo far from being received as an Univerſal Tradition in that very Age wherein we live, that onely one buſie Party in the *Roman* Church do maintain it, Many others eagerly oppoſing it, and all the Princes and States in Chriſtendom do in their actions, if not in words, deny it. And is not this now an Univerſal Tradition fit to be matched with that of the Scriptures? I had once thought to have brought teſtimonies out of every Age of the Chriſtian Church manifeſtly diſproving any ſuch Tradition of Infallibility; and that not only of private perſons when there were no Councils, but from the moſt ſolemn Acts of Councils, and the con-

feſſion of their own Writers; but that would ſwell this Anſwer to too great a Bulk, and is not needful where ſo very little is offered for the proof of it. And yet I ſhall be ready to do it, when any thing more important requires it.

I now return to his exceptions againſt the latter part of the former propoſition, *viz. That Infallibility in a Body of men, is as liable to doubts and diſputes, as in thoſe Books from whence only they derive their Infallibility.* The plain meaning of which is, that it is a fooliſh thing to make uſe of a *medium* as uncertain as the thing which is to be proved by it; and therefore if the Infallibility of the the Church be as liable to doubts and diſputes as that of the Scriptures, it is againſt all juſt Laws of reaſoning to make uſe of the Churches Infallibility to prove the Scriptures by. And to this no anſwer can be proper, but either by ſaying that there is no abſurdity in ſuch a way of proving; or elſe that the Infallibility of the Church is more certain and evident than that of the Scriptures. Which I ſhould be glad to ſee undertaken by any man who pretends to ſenſe; which N. O. doth too much to meddle with it; and therefore fairly ſhuffles it off, and turns my words quite to another meaning, as though they had been ſpoken of the *doubtful ſenſe of the Decrees of Councils*, which although

though elſewhere I had ſufficient reaſon to ſpeak of, yet that was not pertinent to this place. But this was a way to eſcape by ſaying ſomething, though not at all to the purpoſe; and yet he gives no ſufficient anſwer to that ſenſe he puts upon my words, by bringing a Commentary upon them out of words uſed by me in another Diſcourſe. Wherein I did at large argue againſt the Infallibility of General Councils, and after diſproving it in general, I undertook to prove, that no man can have any certainty of Faith as to the Decrees of any Council; becauſe men can have no certainty of Faith that this was a General Council, that it paſſed ſuch Decrees, that it proceeded lawfully in paſſing them, and that this is the certain meaning of them; all which are neceſſary in order to the believing thoſe Decrees to be infallible with ſuch a Faith as they call divine. The words produced by him do ſpeak of the doubtful ſenſe and meaning of the Decrees of Councils, by which I ſhew that men can have no more certainty of the meaning of them, than of doubtful places of Scripture, not as though I ſuppoſed it impoſſible *for Councils to give a clear deciſion in matters of controverſie, ſo as that men might underſtand their meaning*; but I expreſly mention ſuch Decrees as are purpoſely framed in general terms, and with ambiguous ex-

Rat. Account. part. 3. ch. 1. Sect. 4. p. 510.

preſſions to give ſatisfaction to the ſeveral diſſenting Parties; for which I inſtanced in ſome of the *Council of Trent*, whoſe ambiguity is moſt manifeſt by the diſputes about their meaning raiſed by ſome who were preſent at the making of them. I am far enough from denying *that a Commentary may make a Text plainer, or that a Judges ſentence can be clearer than the Law; or that any Council can, or hath decided any thing clearer than the thing that is in controverſie*; which are his exceptions: but I ſay, if Councils pretend to do more than the Scriptures, and to decide controverſies for the ſatisfaction of the World, and that men ought to have that certainty of Faith by them, which they cannot have by the Scriptures, they ought never to be liable to the ſame ambiguity and obſcurity upon the account of which the Scripture is rejected from being a certain rule of Faith. *For*, as he ſaith well, *Infallibility alone ends not Controverſies, but clearneſs; clearneſs in the point controverted:* which if Councils want, they are as unfit to end Controverſies as the Scriptures can be pretended to be. But this is not the thing intended by me in this Propoſition and therefore it needs no farther anſwer; for the only ſubject of that Propoſition, is the Infallibility of the Church, and not the clearneſs of the Decrees of Councils.

But

But I cannot admire the ingenuity of this way of anſwering me, by putting another ſenſe upon my words than they will bear; and by drawing words out of another Diſcourſe, without ſhewing the purpoſe for which they are there uſed, and leaving out the moſt material paſſages which tended to the clearing of them. If *N. O.* thinks fit to oppoſe that whole Diſcourſe againſt the Infallibility of General Councils, and ſet down fairly the ſeveral Arguments, I ſhould be then too blame not to return a juſt anſwer: but I am not bound to follow him in ſuch ſtrange excurſions, from the 17. Propoſition of this Book to a ſingle paſſage in a larger Book, and from that back to another at a mighty diſtance in the ſame Book; which being diſmembred from the Body of the Diſcourſe, muſt needs loſe much of their ſtrength. Yet with all the diſadvantage he takes them (which is ſuch, that the beſt Book in the World may be confuted in that manner) he hath no great cauſe to glory in the execution he hath done upon them. In anſwer to my Lord of *Canterburies* Adverſary, who boaſted of the Unity of the *Roman* Church: becauſe whatever the private opinions of men are, they are ready to ſubmit their judgments to the cenſure and determination of the Church, I had ſaid, "that this will hold "as well or better for our Unity as theirs, be-

Rat. Account. p. 1. ch. 4. p. 101

"cauſe

"cauſe all men are willing to ſubmit their "judgments to Scripture, which is agreed on "all ſides to be infallible. Againſt theſe words thus taken alone *N. O.* ſpends two or three Pages; which might have been ſpared, if he had but fairly expreſſed what immediately follows them in theſe words. "If you ſay it "cannot be known what Scripture determines, "but it may be eaſily what the Church de- "fines: it is eaſily anſwered, that the event "ſhews it to be far otherwiſe, for how many "diſputes are there concerning the power of "determining matters of Faith? to whom it "belongs, in what way it muſt be managed, "whether Parties ought to be heard in matters "of Doctrine, what the meaning of the De- "crees are when they are made, which raiſe as "many diviſions as were before them; as ap- "pears by the Decrees of the Council of "*Trent*, and the later of Pope *Innocent* rela- "ting to the five Propoſitions; ſo that upon "the whole it appears ſetting aſide force and "fraud, which are excellent Principles of "Chriſtian Unity, we are upon as fair terms "of Union as they are among themſelves. I do not therefore ſay, that the Church of *Rome* hath no advantage at all in point of Unity, but that all the advantage it hath, comes from *force* and *fraud*, and ſetting theſe aſide, we are upon as good terms of Union as they; and

we

we do not envy them the effects of Tyranny and Deceit. It is the Union of Christians we contend for, and not of Slaves or Fools; we leave the Turk and the Pope to vie with each other in this kind of Unity, (although I believe the Turk hath much the advantage in it) and I freely yield to *N. O.* that they have a juster pretence to *Unity without Truth* than we. Which is agreeable to what he pleads for, *that they are more united in opinion than we; united in opinion, I say, true or false,* P. 43. saith he, *here matters not; we speak here of Union not of Truth.* P. 44. This and the following of *Tyranny*, which we complain of, are the two fairest Pleas for their *Union* I ever met with. But this is not a place to examine the pretences to Unity on both sides, that I have at large done in a whole Chapter in the late Book, and if *N. O.* had intended any thing to purpose against me on this subject, he ought much rather to have fallen on a just Discourse than two such lame Clauses as he makes these to be by his citation of them. And when he doth that, he may hear more of this Subject; in the mean time *Infallibility* is our business.

§ 9. Of the Argument for Infallibility from Parity of Reason.

And therefore I proceed to the third Argument made use of by *N. O.* for the proof of Infallibility in the Guides of the Church, which is from *parity of Reason*. Because, I say,

Prop. 13. ſay, that it is repugnant to the nature of the deſign, and the wiſdom and goodneſs of God to give infallible aſſurance to perſons, in writing his Will for the benefit of mankind, if thoſe Writings may not be underſtood by all perſons who ſincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them in all ſuch things as are neceſſary to their ſalvation; from hence he inferrs, *That if every Chriſtian may become thus infallible in neceſſaries, from* 1. *a clear rule,* 2. *a due Induſtry uſed*; 3. *and a certainty that it is ſo uſed*; *may not the Church-Governours ſtill much rather be allowed Infallible, and ſo retain ſtill their infallible Guideſhip; and the people alſo, the more clear the rule of Faith is proved to be, the more ſecurely be referred to their direction? and have we not all reaſon to preſume that the chief Guides of the Church (even a General Council of them, or if it be but a major part of this Council, 'tis ſufficient) in their conſults concerning a point neceſſary to ſalvation delivered in Scripture, uſe at leaſt ſo much endeavour (for more needs not) as a plain Ruſtick doth, to underſtand the meaning of it, and alſo the like ſincerity? For what they define for others, they define for themſelves alſo, and their ſalvation is as much concerned as any other mans is, in their miſtakes. And next, why may not theſe Governours upon ſuch certainty of a ſincere endeavour*

deavour and clearneſs of the rule take upon them to define theſe points and enjoyn an aſſent to, and belief of them to their ſubjects; eſpecially ſince it is affirmed that all thoſe from whom they require ſuch obedience, if they pleaſe to uſe a ſincere endeavour may be certain thereof as well as they? And are we not here again arrived at Church-infallibility, if not from extraordinary divine aſſiſtance, only ſincere endeavour being ſuppoſed? And thus doe not his conditional Infallibility of particular perſons in neceſſaries, the condition being ſo eaſie, neceſſarily inferr a moral impoſſibility of the Churches erring in them; eſpecially thoſe neceſſaries being contracted to the Apoſtles Creed, as it is by ſome.

To lay open the weakneſs of this Diſcourſe, which appears fair and plauſible at firſt view, I ſhall give an account of theſe two things.

1. What Infallibility I attribute to private perſons.

2. How far the parity of reaſon will extend to the Infallibility of the Guides of the Church.

1. As to the *Infallibility* by me attributed to private perſons; no ſuch thing can be inferred from my words; and I wiſh *N.O.* would have kept to my own expreſſions, and not foiſted in that term of *Infallibility*, without which all his Diſcourſe would have betrayed its own weak-

weakneſs. For take the terms which I laid down, and apply them to the Guides of the Church, and ſee what a mighty Infallibility ſprings from them. For if it be repugnant to the nature of the deſign, and to the wiſdom and goodneſs of God to give infallible aſſurance to perſons in writing his Will for the benefit of mankind, if thoſe Writings may not be underſtood by all perſons who ſincerely endeavour to know the meaning of them in all ſuch things as are neceſſary for their ſalvation, how doth it hence follow that the Guides of the Church muſt be infallible in teaching matters of Faith? If I had aſſerted that particular perſons were infallible in determining what was true, and what not; then I grant the Argument would have much more held for thoſe whoſe office it is to guide and direct others. But what he means by mens *being infallible in neceſſaries*, I do not well underſtand; for it is capable of three ſeveral meanings: 1. That either men are infallible in judging of neceſſaries to ſalvation; 2. or, That men are infallible in teaching others what are neceſſaries to ſalvation. Or 3. That men are infallible in believing ſuch things as are neceſſary to ſalvation, *i. e.* that ſuch is the goodneſs of God, and the clearneſs of Scriptures, that no man who ſincerely deſires to know what is neceſſary to ſalvation ſhall be deceived there-

therein; and what is this any more than to assert that God will not be wanting in necessaries to mankind; and although I know no reason for using the term of *Infallibility* thus applied, yet the thing it self I assert in that sense, but in neither of the other: and what now can be inferred from hence by a parity of reason, but that the Guides of the Church, supposing the same sincerity shall enjoy the same priviledge, which I know none ever denied them; but what is this to their infallibility in teaching all matters of Faith? which is the only thing to be proved by him. If he can prove this as necessary for the salvation of mankind as the other is, then he would do something to his purpose, but not otherwise. So that all this discourse proceeds upon a very false way of reasoning from believing to teaching, and from necessaries to salvation, to all matters of Faith, which the Guides of the Church shall propose to men.

2. ***But may we not inferr, that if God will not be wanting to particular persons in matters necessary to their salvation, much less will he be wanting to the Guides of the Church in all matters of Faith?*** No certainly, unless it be proved that their Guidance is the only means whereby men can understand what is necessary to salvation; which is utterly denied by us, God having otherwise provided for that,

that, by giving ſo clear a Rule in matters neceſſary, that no man who ſincerely endeavours to know ſuch things ſhall fail therein. *But will not the ſame ſincerity in the Guides of the Church, extend to their knowing and declaring all matters of Faith?* This is a thing poſſible, and ſuppoſing God had entruſted them with the infallible delivery of all matters of Faith, were not to be queſtioned; but that is the thing ſtill in diſpute, and is not to be ſuppoſed, without proving it by plain evidence from thoſe Books which are agreed on both ſides to contain the Will of God. Beſides, that no man that is acquainted with the proceedings of the Council of *Trent*, will ſee reaſon to be over-confident of the ſincerity of Councils ſo palpably influenced by the Court of *Rome* as that was. *But however is it not fit in theſe matters that particular perſons ſhould rather yield to the guidance of others, than to the conduct of their own reaſon?* Which is *N. O's.* farther Argument in this matter, *viz. That a Fallibility being ſuppoſed, it is more fitting to follow prudent and experienced, though fallible perſons direction rather than our own.* To this I anſwer in theſe following particulars.

§ 10. Of the Authority of the Guides of the Church

1. That God hath entruſted every man with a faculty of diſcerning Truth and Falſhood; ſuppoſing that there were no perſons in the World to direct or guide him. For with-

without this there were no capacity in mankind to be instructed in matters of Religion; and it were to no purpose, to offer any thing to men to be believed, or to perswade them to embrace any Religion. To make this plain, I will suppose a Person come to years of understanding, not yet professing any particular Religion to whom the several Religions in the world are proposed by men perswaded of the truth of them, *viz.* the Christian, the Jewish, and the Mahumetan: He hears the several arguments brought for each of them, and hath no greater opinion of the teachers of one than of another, I desire to know whether this person may not see so much of the truth and excellency of Christian Religion, above the rest as to choose that and reject all the rest. I hope no one will deny this; now if a man does here upon his own judgement and reason choose the Christian Religion, so as firmly to believe it, then God hath given to men such a faculty of judging, that upon the proposal of truth and falshood, he may embrace the true Religion and reject the false, and such a Faith is acceptable and pleasing to God; Otherwise no man could embrace Christianity at first upon good grounds.

2. This faculty is not taken away, nor men forbidden the exercise of it in the choice of

their Religion by any principle of the Christian Religion; for our Saviour himself appealed to the Judgement of the persons he endeavored to convince; he made use of many arguments to perswade them, he directed them in the way of finding out of truth, he reproved those who would not search into the things delivered to them. All which were to no purpose at all, if men were not to continue the exercise of their own Judgements about these matters. Accordingly we find the Apostles appealing to the Judgements of private and fallible persons concerning what they said to them, although themselves were infallible, and had the greatest Authority over them; we find them, not bidding *the Guides of the Church prove all things and the people hold fast that which they delivered them*; but Commanding them indifferently *to prove all things and hold fast that which is good*, *i. e.* what upon examination they found to be so; we find those commended, who *searched the Scriptures daily whether the things proposed to them were so or no.* So that we see the Christian Religion doth not forbid men the exercise of that faculty of judging, which God hath given to mankind.

John 5. 36, 9.

1 Cor. 10. 15

1 Thess. 5. 21.

Acts 17 11.

3. The exercise of this faculty was not to cease assoon as men had embraced the Christian

ſtian Doctrine. For the precepts given by the Apoſtles do belong to thoſe who are already Chriſtians, and that concerning the matters propoſed by their Guides; nay they are expreſsly commended to try and examin all pretences to Infallibility and Revelation upon this great reaſon becauſe there ſhould be many falſe pretenders to them. *Beloved believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they be of God, for many falſe Prophets are gone out into the world.* They are commanded *not to believe any other Goſpel though Apoſtles or an Angel from Heaven ſhould preach it*; and how ſhould they know whether it were another or the ſame if they were not to examin and compare them? They are bid *to contend earneſtly for the faith once delivered to the Saints*; it might be a new Faith for any thing they could know, if they were not competent Judges of what was once delivered: They are frequently charged *to beware of Seducers and falſe Guides, that ſhould come in the name of Chriſt and his Apoſtles*; they are told, *that there ſhould come a falling away and departing from the Faith*; and that *the time will come when men will not endure ſound Doctrine, and ſhall turn away their ears from the truth and believe fables*; *that ſuch ſhall come with all deceivableneſs of unrighteouſneſs*; *with powers and ſigns and*

1 John 4. 1 Gal. 1. 8.

Jude v. 4.

Mat. 24. 4, 5. 23 24. Acts. 20. 29 30. 1 Tim. 4. 1 2 Theſſ. 2. 3. 2 Tim. 4. 3, 4. 2 Theſſ. 2. 9, 10.

lying wonders. To what end or purpoſe are all theſe things ſaid, if men being once Chriſtians are no longer to exerciſe their own Judgements, but deliver them up into the hands of their Guides? What is this, but to put them under a neceſſity of being deluded when their Guides pleaſe? and as our Saviour ſaith, *When the blind lead the blind both ſhall fall into the ditch.*

Matt. 15. 14.

4. The Authority of Guides in the Church is not abſolute and unlimited but confined within certain bounds. Which if they tranſgreſs they are no longer to be followed. So *St. Paul ſaith, if we or an Angel from Heaven teach any other Goſpel let him be accurſed*, ſo that the Apoſtles themſelves though giving the greateſt Evidence of Infallibility were no longer to be followed than they held to the Goſpel of Chriſt. And they deſired no more of their greateſt Diſciples whom they had Converted to the Chriſtian Faith, than *to be followers of them as they were of Chriſt*, they told them *they had no dominion over their faith*, although they were far more aſſiſted with an infallible Spirit, than any other Guides of the Church could pretend to be ever ſince. Therefore no preſent Guides, what ever names they go by, ought to uſurp ſuch an Authority over the minds of men which the Apoſtles themſelves did not chal-

Gal. 1. 8.

1 Cor. 11. 1.

2 Cor. 1. 24.

lenge; although there were greater reaſon for men to yield up their minds wholly to their guidance. We are far from denying all reaſonable and juſt authority to be given to the Guides of the Church; but we ſay that their Authority not being abſolute is confined to ſome known rule; And where there is a rule for them to proceed by, there is a rule for others to Judge of their proceedings; and conſequently men muſt exerciſe their Judgements about the matters they determin whether they be agreeable to that rule or not.

5. Where the Rule by which the Guides of the Church are to proceed hath determined nothing, there we ſay the Authority of the Guides is to be ſubmitted unto. For otherwiſe, there would be nothing left, wherein their Authority could be ſhewn, and others pay obedience to them, on the account of it. Therefore we plead for the Churches Authority in all matters of meer order and decency, in indifferent rites and ceremonies; and think it an unreaſonable thing to debar the Governours of a Chriſtian ſociety the Privilege of Commanding in things which God hath not already determined by his own Law. We plead for the reſpect and reverence which is due to the Lawful conſtitutions of the Church whereof we are members; and aſſert the juſt Authority of the Guides of it, in the

exercise of that power which is committed to the Governours of it; as the successours of the Apostles in their care of the Christian Church, although not in their Infallibility.

6. We allow a very great Authority to the Guides of the Catholick Church in the best times of Christianity; and look upon the concurrent sense of Antiquity as an excellent means to understand the mind of Scripture in places otherwise doubtful and obscure. We profess a great Reverence to the Ancient Fathers of the Church: but Especially when assembled in free and General Councils; We reject the ancient heresies condemned in them; which we the rather believe to be against the Scripture, because so ancient, so wise and so great persons did deliver the contrary doctrine, not only to be the sense of the Church in their own time but ever since the Apostles. Nay we reject nothing that can be proved by an univertal Tradition from the Apostolical times downwards; but we have so great an opinion of the Wisdom and Piety of those excellent Guides of the Church in the Primitive times, that we see no reason to have those things forced upon us now, which we offer to prove to be contrary to their doctrine and practice. So that the controversy between us is not about the Authority of the Guides of the Church, but whether the

the Guides of the Apoſtolical and Primitive times ought not to have greater Authority over us, than thoſe of the preſent Church in things wherein they contradict each other? This is the true State of the Controverſy between us; and all the clamours of rejecting the Authority of Church Guides are vain and impertinent. But we profeſs to yield greater reverence and ſubmiſſion of mind to Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, than to any Guides of the Church ever ſince: we are ſure they ſpake by an Infallible Spirit, and where they have determined matters of Faith or practice, we look upon it as arrogance and preſumption in any others to alter what they have declared. And for the Ages ſince, we have a much greater eſteem for thoſe neareſt the Apoſtolical times and ſo downwards, till Ignorance, Ambition, and private Intereſts ſway'd too much among thoſe who were called the Guides of the Church. And that by the confeſſion of thoſe who were members of it at the ſame time; which makes us not to wonder that ſuch corruptions of doctrine and practice ſhould then come in: but we do juſtly wonder at the ſincerity of thoſe who would not have them reformed and taken away.

7. In matters impoſed upon us to believe or practiſe which are repugnant to plain commands of Scripture, or the Evidence of ſenſe,

or the grounds of Chriſtian Religion; we aſſert that no Authority of the preſent Guides of a Church, is to overrule our faith or practice. For there are ſome things ſo plain, that no Man will be guided by anothers opinion in them; If any Philoſopher did think his Authority ought to overrule an Ignorant Mans opinion, in ſaying the ſnow which he ſaw to be white was not ſo; I would fain know whether that Man did better to believe his eyes or the prudent, experienc'd Philoſopher? I am certain, if I deſtroy the Evidence of ſenſe I muſt overthrow the grounds of Chriſtian Religion; and I am as certain if I believe that not to be bread which my ſenſes tell me is ſo, I muſt deſtroy the greateſt Evidence of ſenſe; and which is fitter for me, to reject that Evidence which aſſures my Chriſtianity to me, or that Authority which by its impoſitions on my faith overthrows the certainty of ſenſe? We do not ſay that we are to reject any doctrine delivered in Scripture which concerns a Being infinitely above our underſtanding, becauſe we cannot comprehend all things contained in it; but in matters lyable to ſenſe and the proper objects of it, we muſt beg pardon if we prefer the grounds of our common Chriſtianity before a novel and monſtrous figment, hatched in the times of Ignorance and Barbariſm, foſter'd by faction,

faction, and impoſed by Tyranny. We find no command ſo plain in Scripture that we muſt believe the Guides of the Church in all they deliver, as there is that we muſt not worſhip Images, that we muſt pray with underſtanding, that we muſt keep to our Saviours Inſtitution of the Lords ſupper; but if any Guides of a Church pretend to an Authority to evacuate the force of theſe Laws, we do not ſo much reject their Authority, as prefer Gods above them. Doth that Man deſtroy the authority of Parents, that refuſes to obey them, when they Command him to commit Treaſon? That is our caſe in this matter, ſuppoſing ſuch Guides of a Church which otherwiſe we are bound to obey, if they require things contrary to a direct Command of God, muſt we prefer their Guidance before Gods? If they can prove us miſtaken we yield, but till then the Queſtion is not, whether the Guides of the Church muſt be ſubmitted to rather than our own reaſon? but whether Gods authority or theirs muſt be obeyed? And I would gladly know whether there be not ſome Points of faith, and ſome parts of our duty, ſo plain, that no Church-Authority determining the contrary ought to be obey'd?

8. No abſolute ſubmiſſion can be due to thoſe Guides of a Church who have oppoſed and contradicted each other, and condemned one another for errour and hereſy. For then

in

in caſe of abſolute ſubmiſſion a Man muſt yield his aſſent to contradictions; and for the ſame reaſon that he is to be a Catholick at one time, he muſt be a heretick at another. I hope the Guides of the preſent Church pretend to no more infallibility and Authority than their predeceſſours in the ſame Capacity with themſelves have had; and we ſay they have contradicted the ſenſe of thoſe before them in the matters in diſpute between us. Yet that is not the thing I now inſiſt upon; but that theſe Guides of the Church have declared each other to be fallible by condemning their opinions and practices; and by that means have made it neceſſary for men to believe thoſe not to be infallible, unleſs both parts of a contradiction may be infallibly true. Suppoſe a Man living in the times of the prevalency of Arrianiſm, when almoſt all the Guides of the Church declared in favour of it, when ſeveral great Councils oppoſed and contradicted that of Nice, when Pope *Liberius* did ſubſcribe the Sirmian confeſſion and Communicated with the Arrians, what advice would *N. O.* give ſuch a one if he muſt not exerciſe his own Judgement, and compare both the doctrines by the rule of Scriptures? muſt he follow the preſent Guides even the Pope himſelf? Then he muſt joyn with the the Arrians. Muſt he adhere to the Nicene Council?

Councils but there were more numerous Councils which condemned it. What remedy can be supposed in such a case, but that every person must search and examine the several doctrines, according to his best ability, and judge what is best for him to believe and practise? No answer can be more absurd in this case than that which some give, that Liberius only erred in his *External profession of faith and not in the belief of it*; for we are now speaking of such as are to be *Guides* to others, and on whose direction they are to rely, which must be something which may be known to them. Supposing then, that Liberius when he subscribed and joyned with the Arrians, was a Catholick in his heart this takes as much off from the Authority of a Guide, as Errour would do. For who dare rely upon him who acts against his conscience and believes one way and does another? Would any in the Church of Rome think it fit to submit themselves to the direction of such persons, whom they were assured, did not believe one word of what they professed; but joyned in communion with that Church only for some temporal ends? But in truth *Liberius* went so far, that *Hilary* denounces an *Anathema* against him, and all that joyned with him. Neither was this the only case of this nature to be supposed; for the

the Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon* proving ineffectual for the ſuppreſſion of the Neſtorian and Eutychian hereſies, and rather greater diſturbances ariſing in the Church after the later of theſe, becauſe the writings of *Theodorus* of *Mopſueſtia* and *Theodoret* againſt *Cyril*, and of *Ibas* to *Maris* the *Perſian* not being therein condemned which were ſuppoſed to favour the Neſtorian hereſy, the *Neſtorians* increaſing their faction under the Authority of thoſe writings, and the *Eutychians* making that their plea for rejecting that *Council* becauſe it ſeemed to favour *Neſtorianiſm*; the Emperour Juſtinian by the perſwaſion of *Theodorus* of *Cæſarea* reſolves to have thoſe *three Chapters* (as they were called) condemned, hoping by this means to perſwade the Eutychian faction to accept the Council of *Chalcedon* and thereby to ſettle peace in the Church, which was then miſerably rent and divided. To this end by the conſent of the four Eaſtern Patriarchs, he publiſhes an *Edict* wherein he condemns the *three Chapters*, and Anathematizes thoſe who ſhould defend them; to this *Edict* the Guides of the Eaſtern Church ſubſcribed; But *Vigilius* then *Pope*, (although *Victor Tununenſis*, a Writer of that Age ſaith, *that he had given it under his hand to Theodora the Empreſs, that if he might be made Pope he*

Victor Tunumenſ Chronic. Poſt Conſulat. Baſilii.

he would condemn the three Chapters) yet now being by violent hands thrust into the chair, he changes his mind, and declares against the *Edict*; and threatens excommunication to those who approved it as being contrary to the Catholick faith, established in the Council of Chalcedon; and accordingly *Stephanus* his *Legat* withdrew from the communion of the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*. Upon this, the Emperour sends for *Vigilius* to *Constantinople*, who being come thither excommunicates the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* and all who condemned the *three Chapters*, or joyned with those who condemned them; and the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* again excommunicates him; but after 4. or 5. months time, these excommunications were taken off: and Pope *Vigilius* after that publishes a *decree* wherein the *three Chapters* were condemned by him, with a *Salvo* to the authority of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. Which made the Bishops of *Africa*, *Illyricum* and *Dalmatia* to fall off from him, and *Rusticus* and *Sebastianus* two *Deacons* of his own Church; whom the Pope excommunicated for so doing. Yet the Emperour himself was not satisfied with that *Salvo*, and the Pope not yielding without it, a General Council was called at *Constantinople* to put an end to this Controversy; to which the

Pope

Pope being ſolemnly invited refuſed to come, the Council however proceeds in the examination of the *three Chapters*; during their ſeſſion, *Vigilius* publiſhes his Apoſtolical decree or *Conſtitution*, to the whole Catholick Church, with the aſſiſtance of 16. Biſhops of Italy, Africa, and Illyricum, and three Roman Deacons; wherein the Pope defends the *three Chapters*, and defines in the concluſion of it, *That it ſhould be lawful for none to write or teach any thing about theſe matters, contrary to his preſent Definition; or to move any farther queſtion about them.* Notwithſtanding which Definition of the Popes, the Council proceeds to the condemning the *three Chapters*, and to the *Anathematizing* thoſe who did not condemn them. That this is the true matter of fact, I am content to appeal to the *Acts* of the *Council*, the *Edict* of *Juſtinian*, the Popes own *Decree*, or the *Writers* of that *Age*, or the moſt learned perſons of the Roman Church, ſuch as *Baronius*, *Petavius* and *Petrus de Marca*, who have all given an account of this Controverſy. I now deſire to know, what a perſon in that time ſhould do who was bound to yield an internal aſſent to the Guides of the Church? muſt he believe the Pope? He not only contradicts the Council but himſelf too; for it now appears by a Greek

Baron. A.D. 546. 547 558. *Petav dogmat. Theolog. Tom. 4. l 1. c. 18 Petr. de Marca, diſſert. de Vigilii decreto.*

Greek Epiſtle firſt publiſhed by *Petrus de Marcâ* out of the King of Frances Library that *Vigilius* being baniſhed by *Juſtinian* did afterwards retract his own decree ſo ſolemnly made, and confirmed the Council. Would not a man now be in a pretty condition that were bound to believe one in all he ſaid that ſo often contradicted himſelf? Muſt he believe the Council? what then becomes of the Popes infallibility? when they were ſo far from receiving the Popes definition (though done in ſuch a manner, in which *Bellarmin* ſaith, *the Pope cannot err*, viz. *When he teaches the whole Church*;) that they reject his decree and determin the quite contrary. I know but one way of evading this, (which is that commonly inſiſted on by thoſe of the Roman Church,) viz. *that all this was not a Controverſy about faith but perſons.* So indeed ſome of the ſucceſſours of *Vigilius* ſaid, when they endeavoured to extenuate the matter as much as they could finding that the Biſhops of *Africa*, and many in *Italy* broke off from the Communion of the Roman Church on the account of this quarrel; But I deſire any one in this matter to look to their Judgement who were concerned in this quarrel; and if men are bound to believe their Guides, they ought to believe them when they tell them what is a matter

Bell. de Rom. Pontif. l. 4. c. 3.

of

of faith. And from the beginning of this controverſy it was accounted a matter of faith, not only by the Emperour, but by the Pope, by the Council, and by the Biſhops who oppoſed the Council; and muſt we truſt them in other things and not in this? Beſides, the very proceedings of the Council manifeſt it according to *Bellarmins* own rules; for faith he, *we then know a thing to be matter of faith, when the Council declares it to be ſo, or them to be hereticks who hold the contrary; or, which is the moſt common, when they denounce Anathema, and exclude from the Church, thoſe who hold otherwiſe*; all which agree to this, as will appear by the laſt collation of that Council. And Pope *Vigilius* in the *Greek* Epiſtle now publiſhed in the *Tomes* of the *Councils*, wherein he approves the 5th Council, not only condemns the three Chapters as contrary to faith, but *Anathematizes* all thoſe who ſhould defend them: and like an Infallible Judge very ſolemnly recants his former Apoſtolical decree, though delivered by him upon great deliberation, and with an intention to teach the whole Church. I wonder who there could be in that Age, that believed the Pope to be an infallible Guide? not the Eaſtern Biſhops; who excommunicated him, and decreed directly contrary to him; not the Weſtern, for they likewiſe ex-

Bellarm. de Concil. Auctor. l. 2. c. 12.

excommunicated him, and not only forſook his Communion, but that of the Roman Church: but did he believe himſelf infallible, when he ſo often changed his mind, and contradicted himſelf *in Cathedra?* If he did, he was without doubt a brave man, and did as much as man can do.

This Controverſy was ſcarce at an end, (for the Biſhops of *Iſtria* continued in their ſeparation from the Roman Church for 70. years, wch was till the time of *Honorius* A.D. *626.*) when another was ſtarted, which gives us yet a more ample diſcovery of the more than fallibility of the Guides of the Church in that Age, when a Pope was condemned for a Heretick by a General Council; in which caſe, I would fain know whether of them was infallible? and to which of the Guides of the Church a man owed his internal aſſent, and external obedience? This being an Inſtance of ſo high a nature, that the truth of it being ſuppoſed, the pretence of abſolute Authority and Infallibility in the Guides of the Roman Church muſt fall to the ground, no wonder, that all imaginable arts have been uſed by thoſe of the Church of Rome to take away the force of it; among whom *Pighius*, *Baronius*, *Bellarmin*, *Petavius*, and *Petrus de Marcâ* have laboured hardeſt in acquitting *Honorius*, but have proceeded

in different ways; and the two laſt are content the Pope ſhould be condemned for *ſimplicity* and *negligence*, the better to excuſe him from *hereſy*; but one would think theſe two were as contrary to the office of a *truſty Guide*, as *hereſy* to one that pretends to be *infallible*. But the better to underſtand the force of this Inſtance, I ſhall give a brief account of the matter of fact, as it is agreed on all ſides; and the repreſenting the diviſions among the *Guides* of *the Church* at that time, will plainly ſhew how unreaſonable it had been, to have required abſolute ſubmiſſion to ſuch who ſo vehemently contradicted each other.

We are therefore to underſtand, that the late *Council* at *Conſtantinople* being found unſucceſsful, for bringing the *Eutychians* and their off-ſpring, to a ſubmiſſion to the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, another *expedient* was found out for that end, *viz.* that acknowledging two natures in Chriſt they ſhould agree in owning that there was but one will and operation in him after the Union of both natures: becauſe will and operation were ſuppoſed to flow from the Perſon and not barely from the nature; and the aſſerting two wills would imply two contrary principles in Chriſt which were not to be ſuppoſed. This *Expedient* was firſt propoſed to *Hera-*

clius

clius the Emperour by *Athanasius* the *Patriarch* of the *Jacobites*, or *Paulus* the *Severian* and approved by *Sergius* Patriarch of Constantinople, and by *Cyrus* of Alexandria, and *Theodorus* Bishop of Pharan near Ægypt. *Cyrus* proceeded so far in it as by that means to reconcile the *Theodosiani*, a sort of Eutychians in Alexandria, to the Church, of which he gives an account to *Sergius* of *Constantinople* and sends him the *Anathema*'s which he published, among which the 7th. was against those who asserted, more than one operation in Christ. *Sergius* approves what *Cyrus* had done; but *Sophronius* a learned Monk, coming to Alexandria vehemently opposed *Cyrus* in this business; but *Cyrus* persisting he makes his address to *Sergius* at *Constantinople*, and tells him of the dangerous heresy that was broaching under the pretence of Union; after some heats *Sergius* yielded, that nothing should be farther said of either side. But *Sophronius* being made *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, he publishes an Encyclical Epistle wherein he asserts two operations and Anathematizes those who held the contrary and were for the Union; and writes to *Honorius* then Pope, giving him an account of this new heresy of the *Monothelites*; the same year *Sergius* writes to him likewise of all transactions that had hitherto

been in this matter, and desires to know his judgement in such an affair, wherein the Peace of the Church was so much concerned. *Honorius* writes a very solemn letter to *Sergius*, wherein he condemns the contentious humour of *Sophronius*, and makes as good a confession of his faith as he could, in which he expresly asserts that there was but *one Will in Christ* and agrees with *Sergius that there should be no more disputing about one or two operations in Christ.* Accordingly *Heraclius* by the advice of *Sergius* publishes his *Ecthesis* or *declaration* to the same purpose, which was approved by a *Synod* under *Sergius*; but opposed by *John* 4. *Bishop* of *Rome*, yet still maintained at *Constantinople* not only by *Sergius*, but by *Pyrrhus*, and *Paulus* his successours, who were both excommunicated by *Theodorus* succeeding *John*; after him *Pope Martin* calls a *Council*, wherein he condemns all the Eastern Bishops who favoured this new heresy, and the two *Edicts* of silence published by *Heraclius* and *Constans*: but was for his pains sent for to Constantinople and there dyed. These contentions daily increasing, after the death of *Constans*, *Constantinus Pogonatus* resolves to try all ways for the peace of the Church; and therefore calls a General Council at *Constantinople* A. D. 680. where the Heresy of the *Mono-*

Concil. Constat. 3. Act. 13.

Monothelites was condemned; and the Writings of *Sergius*, *Cyrus*, *Theodorus* and *Honorius* in this matter, *as repugnant to the doctrine of the Apoſtles, and decrees of Councils and the judgement of the Fathers; and agreeable to the falſe doctrine of Hereticks and deſtructive to ſouls:* and not content meerly to condemn their doctrine, they further proceed to *Anathamatize*, and *expunge out of the Church the names of Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Petrus, Paulus, and Theodorus:* and after theſe, *Honorius, as agreeing in all things with Sergius and confirming his wicked doctrines.*

Here we are now come to the main point; we ſee a Pope delivering his judgement in a matter of faith concerning the whole Church condemned for a *Heretick* by a General Council for ſo doing: either he was rightly condemned or not; if rightly, what becomes of the infallibility of the Pope when he pretends to teach the whole Church in a matter of faith? If not rightly, what becomes of the authority and ſincerity of General Councils, if a Council ſo ſolemnly proceeding ſhould condemn one for Hereſy, that not only did not err; but if ſome may be believed, could not? Surely the Council never thought of that, when they make no ſcruple of condemning him with the reſt. What? were

Pope *Agatho*'s Legats there preſent, and could not inform the Council of their preſumption in judging the Infallible See? But no ſuch thing was heard of in thoſe times; theſe latter Ages have been only bleſſed with the knowledge of this unerring priviledge; and happy had it been if all the records of former times had been burnt, that no Inſtances might have been brought to overthrow it. Yet wit and induſtry have not been wanting to bring poor *Honorius* off, if it had been poſſible: the ſum of all may be reduced to theſe 3. Anſwers. 1. Either that the Acts of the Council are falſifyed. Or. 2. That the Pope did not err in faith. Or. 3. Suppoſing he did err, it was only as a private perſon and not as Head of the Church.

1. That the Acts of the Council are falſifyed. This is a ſhrewed ſign of a deſperate cauſe, when againſt the conſent of all ancient Copies, both Greek and Latin, and the Teſtimonies of ſeveral Popes and Councils afterwards, learned men are driven to ſo miſerable a ſhift as this. The firſt I find, who made this anſwer was *Albertus Pighius*, and after him *Baronius* and *Bellarmin* have embraced it: but the more ingenuous men of their own Church have been aſhamed of it. *Melchior Canus* confeſſeth that not only this

Can. lat. Tbeol. l. 6. c. 8.

General

General Council, but the ſeventh, and eighth under Adrian, and that ſeveral other Popes have confeſſed the truth of the thing; and therefore he doth not ſee how *Pighius* can vindicate *Honorius* in this matter. *Franciſcus Torrenſis* (afterwards better known by the name of *Turrianus*) a man highly applauded by *Baronius*, *Hoſius*, *Lindanus*, and others, writ a Book of the 6. 7. and 8. Synod, wherein he ſeverely chaſtiſes *Pighius* for his ill uſage of this *ſixth Council*, and ſaith that in this matter he ſhewed more prejudice than judgement. For, whereas he ſuſpects that the letter of *Honorius* to *Sergius* was not ſufficiently examined and compared with the Original, this betray's ſaith *Turrianus*, his great negligence in reading the Acts of the Council; for in the latter end of the 12. Seſſion, it is expreſly ſaid that the Authentick Latin Epiſtle of *Honorius* was produced and compared by the *Biſhop* of *Porto*; Beſides how comes, ſaith he, the name of *Honorius* to be no leſs than 9. times in the Council? and if all this had been by the Greeks corrupting the Copies, ſurely they would never have left that paſſage remaining concerning the corrupting the letters of *Mennas* and *Vigilius*: How comes *Leo* 2. in his Epiſtle to the Emperour wherein he confirms the Council, to Anathematize *Honorius* by name as guilty of hereſy; ſome indeed,

Franciſc. Torrenſ. de 6. 7. 8. Synod. Flor. A.D. 1551.

P. 11. 12.

P. 14.

deed, saith he, may say this is counterfeit too, (so do *Baronius* and *Binius*) but they have nothing but their bare conjecture for it, no argument, or authority to confirm it. Not only the Greek Writers, but the Latin confess he was there condemned, so doth *Bede*, saith he, so doth the *Pontifical Book* in the life of *Leo* 2. and in the Council under *Martin* at *Rome* the Epistle of *Paulus* to *Theodorus* was read, wherein was mentioned the consent of *Honorius* and *Sergius*, and no one there opposed it. *Humbertus* Legat of Leo 9. in his Book against the *Greeks* reckons *Honorius* among the condemned *Monothelites*. How came all the Copies to be corrupted at once, as he farther urges, that there are none left found to correct others by? But that which he insists upon as the strongest argument of all is, from *Hadrian* 2. who calling a Council at Rome for the condemning of *Photius*, for Anathematizing him, hath these remarkable words; *that no Bishop of Rome was Anathematized before unless it were Honorius who after his death was condemned for heresy, in which case alone it is lawful for inferiours to resist their Superiours and to reject their doctrine; although even there, they would never have done it if the Bishop of the first See had not consented to it.* A very considerable Testimony; not only to prove

P. 24.

Extat. *Allocutio* 3. *Hadriani* 2. ad Conc. Ro. Tom 8. Conc. Gen. *Ed Lut.* Par. 1671. P. 1091.

prove that *Honorius* was comdemned for hereſy, but that a Pope may be guilty of it and be lawfully proceeded againſt for it, and that Pope *Agatho* did himſelf conſent to the condemnation of *Honorius*. Notwithſtanding theſe arguments of *Torrenſis*, *Baronius* ſeeing that no other defence could be made, perſiſts in the ſame accuſation of *Forgery*: and out of his own head frames an improbable ſtory of the corrupting the Copies of the Council by *Theodorus*, *who being*, ſaith he, *Anathematized as a Monothelite*, *expunged his own name and put in that of Honorius*. A fiction ſo groundleſs and unreaſonable, that nothing but meer deſpair could drive a man of common underſtanding to it. For there is not the leaſt countenance for it in any Author; not the leaſt colour of probability in the thing. For, that, all the Copies of the Council ſhould be corrupted by one man, and neither the Popes Legats preſent at the Council nor any elſe ſhould take notice of it; That, no ſucceeding Popes ſhould diſcover it, when they were concerned to vindicate *Honorius*, but did own the thing to be true; that *Theodorus* then living ſhould be condemned, before it was known whether he would ſubmit to the Council or not; that, in the ſeventh and eighth Councils this ſhould not be at all ſuſpected, but the condemning *Honorius* ex-

Baron. A.D. 681. *n.* 29.

expreſly mentioned in both; that, a man at that time depoſed from his Patriarchat of Conſtantinople ſhould be able to make ſuch a razure and forgery in the Copies of the Councils; that the Emperour Conſtantine who took ſo much care about the Council ſhould ſuffer ſuch a thing to be done, do all make this figment of *Baronius* ſo remote from any likelyhood, that *Baronius* had need to have prayed as once a man upon the rack did, that he might tell *probable lyes.* But all the miſcarriages of *Baronius* in this matter are ſo fully laid open by one of their own Church, that I need not Inſiſt any longer upon it; to whom no anſwer hath been given but that ſubſtantial one of an *Index Expurgatorius.* *Bellarmin* likes this way of anſwering the difficulty about *Honorius*; but the greateſt ſtrength he adds to *Baronius* is only laying, *without doubt it is ſo:* and he grants that the Seventh and Eighth Council did believe that Pope *Honorius* was condemned, but he ſaith they were deceived by the falſe Acts of the Council. But however they muſt believe that the Pope might fall into hereſy and be condemned by a Council for it. Yet *Bellarmin* hath a fetch in this caſe beyond *Baronius* viz. *That either the Acts of the Council are falſified, or the Council was guilty of intolerable impudence and errour in condemning*

Franciſ. Combefis Hiſtoria hæreſ. Monothelitar. c. 2. Alex 7. Index Expurgator. p. 277. Bellarm. de Rom. Pontifice l. 4. c. 11.

demning Honorius without reaſon; For all the evidence they produce againſt him is from his Epiſtles in which, ſaith he, *nothing is contained, but what is ſound and orthodox*; And this was the ſecond way of defending *Honorius* viz. that he did not err in faith at all; and this way is taken by *Petavius*, and others; and was the way intended by *Petrus de Marcâ*, as appears by the account given of his deſign by *Baluzius*; which was firſt to prove by moſt evident arguments, that the Acts of the Council were never corrupted by the *Greeks*, againſt the opinion before mentioned, and next that he was truly condemned by the Council; but not for hereſy, but only for negligence and remiſsneſs. I think there needs nothing to ſhew the weakneſs of this, but barely reading the *Anathema* of the Council againſt him, which is not, *for bare negligence but for confirming the wicked doctrines of Sergius*. And I am apt to think, that learned perſon ſaw the weakneſs of his deſign too much to go on with it: and *Baronius and Bellarmin* ſaw well enough, that whoſoever was there Anathematized it was upon the account of *hereſy* that he was ſo; and therefore *Baronius* would make men believe the *Anathema* belonged to *Theodorus* and not to *Honorius*. *Petavius* thinks that *Honorius* was deceived, but it was only by his

Petav. dogmat. Theol. l. 1. c. 21. ſ. 11

Baluzius de vi â Petri Marcæ p. 28. 29.

Petav. ib. ſect. 13.

his *ſimplicity and weakneſs*, not underſtanding the Controverſy aright. So of old *John* 4. and *Maximus* in his diſpute with *Pyrrhus* defended *Honorius*, that he ſpake indeed of *one Will*, *but that*, ſay they, *was to be underſtood only of one Will in his humane nature*. Which as *Combefis* ſaith, is *a more pious than ſolid defence of him*; and would as well ſerve, for *Sergius* and *Cyrus*, for *Heraclius* his *Ecthеſis* and *Conſtans* his *Type*, as *Honorius* his letter. For who ever will peruſe them, will find they all proceed on the ſame argument, that there could not be two wills in Chriſt but one muſt be contrary to the other. But that which I inſiſt on is this, that it is certain the Council approved by the Pope did condemn him for hereſy; I deſire therefore again to know whether he was rightly condemned or not; if he was, then the *Pope* muſt be guilty, and ſo not infallible; if not, than the Council muſt be, according to *Bellarmin*, guilty of *intolerable impudence and errour*; but in either caſe, there was no infallibility in the *Guides* of the Church which could require our internal aſſent to what they declared. But another defence is yet behind, which is, that though the Pope did erre, yet it was in his *private Capacity*, and not as Head of the Church. But when doth he act as *Head* of the *Church*

Combefis. c. 2. ſect. 3.

if

if not, when he is consulted about important matters of faith, as this was then supposed to be, by two Patriarchs; and when the Church was divided about them; and there upon solemnly delivers his opinion? This is then a meer subterfuge when men have nothing else to say; I conclude therefore this Instance of *Honorius* with the ingenuous confession of Mr. White, ***that things are so clear in the cause of Honorius, that it is unworthy any grave Divine to pawn his own honour and that of Divinity too, in sowing together Fig-leaves to palliate it.*** *Tabulæ suſ-frag. p.130.*

Thus far I have shewn that those who pretend the most to be infallible Guides of the Church have opposed and condemned each other; from whence it necessarily follows that no absolute submission is due to them, unless we can be obliged to believe contradictions. I might pursue this much further, and draw down the History of these contradictions to each other, through the following Ages of the Church; wherein Bishops have been against Bishops, Popes against Popes, Councils against Councils, Church against Church; especially after the breach between the Eastern and Greek Churches, the Greek and the Roman, and the Roman and those of the Reformation; But a man who is bound to rely only on the Authority of his Guides, must

muſt ſuppoſe them to be agreed; and in caſe of difference among them, he muſt firſt chooſe his Religion and by that his Guide.

9. In the preſent divided State of the Chriſtian Church, a man that would ſatisfy his own mind, muſt make uſe of his judgement in the choice of his Church, and thoſe Guides he is to ſubmit to. Unleſs a man will ſay, that every one is bound to yield himſelf abſolutely to the Guidance of that Church which he lives in whether *Eaſtern* or *Greek*, *Roman* or *Proteſtant*: which I ſuppoſe N. O. will never yield to, for a reaſon he knows becauſe then no Revolter from us could be juſtified. The true State then of the preſent caſe concerning the *Guides* of the *Catholick Church* is this; that it hath been now for many Ages rent and torn into ſeveral diſtinct Communions; every one of which Communions, hath particular *Guides* over it, who pretend it to be the duty of men to live in ſubjection to them; becauſe every *Church* doth ſuppoſe it ſelf to be in the right; now the Queſtion propoſed is, whether it be not fitter for me to ſubmit to the *Guides* of the *Catholick Church*, than to truſt my own judgement? I ſhould make no ſcruple in all doubtful matters to reſolve the affirmative, ſuppoſing that all the Guides of the Catholick Church were Agreed; for I ſhould think it arrogance and pre-

preſumption in me to ſet up my own private opinion in oppoſition to the unanimous conſent of all the Guides of the Catholick Church, in ſuch a caſe; but that is far from ours, for we find the Chriſtian World divided into very different Communions. The *Eaſtern Churches* are ſtill as numerous, though not ſo proſperous as the *Roman*; the extent of the *Greek Church* alone is very great, but beſides that, there are two other diſtinct Churches in thoſe parts who break off Communion with the *Greek* on the Account of the Councils of *Epheſus* and *Chalcedon*; and the latter ſort eſpecially are very far ſpread in thoſe parts, from *Armenia* to the *Abyſſine Empire*. In the time of *Jacobus de Vitriaco*, he ſaith *theſe two Churches were ſaid to be more numerous than the Greek and the Latin*; and *Bellonius* in theſe later times aſſures us, *that the rites of the Greek Church do yet extend farther than the Latin*. What then makes theſe Churches to be left out in our Enquiries after the Guides of the Catholick Church? Are theſe ſuch inconſiderable parts of the Body, that no regard is to be had to them? I believe upon a ſtrict examination, notwithſtanding the reproach of hereſy and Schiſm, which thoſe of the Church of Rome caſt upon all but themſelves, they will be found much more ſound parts of the Catholick

Jacob. de Vitriaco hiſt. Orient. Cap. 77.

Bellonii Obſer. l. 1. c. 35.

lick Church, than the Roman Church is Five great Bodies or Communions of Christians are at this day in the World. 1. The most *Eastern Christians*, commonly called *Nestorians* whether justly or no I shall not now examine, these are spread over the most Eastern parts, and all live in subjection to the *Patriarch* of *Mozal*. 2. The *Jacobites*, who are dispersed through *Mesopotamia*, *Armenia*, *Ægypt* and the *Abyssine Empire*, and live under several *Patriarchs* of their own. 3. The *Greek Church*, of which, besides the *Moscovites*, are to be reckoned the *Melchites* or *Suriani*, and the *Georgians*; for though their language be different, they all agree in Doctrine. 4. The *Roman Church*, taking under it all in the Eastern parts who have submitted to the *Bishop* of *Rome*. 5. The *Protestant Churches* who have cast off subjection to the Pope, and Reformed the corruptions they charge the Church of Rome with. Now of these 5. parts, 4. of them are all agreed, that there is no necessity of living in subjection to the *Guides* of the *Roman Church*; but they are all under their own proper Guides, wch they do not Question will direct them in the right way to Heaven. Only those of the Church of Rome take upon themselves against all sense and reason to be the *Catholick Church*, and so exclude 4. parts

of

of 5. out of a capacity of Salvation; and challenge Infallibility as belonging to the Guides of it alone. In this caſe, the Arrogance of the pretence, the uncharitableneſs of rejecting ſo mighty a number of Chriſtians from the poſſibility of Salvation, are ſufficient to make any Man not yield up his Faith at the firſt demand; but to conſider a while, whether there be no other Churches, or Guides in thoſe Churches? when he finds ſo many and thoſe not inferiour to the *Roman Church* in any thing ſave only in pomp, pride, and uncharitableneſs; and all oppoſing thoſe arrogant pretences of Authority and Infallibility in it, what reaſon can he have, ſuppoſing that he is to ſubmit to any Guides, that he muſt ſubmit only to thoſe of the Roman Church? Why not as well to thoſe of the Eaſtern, Greek, or Proteſtant Churches? If any one goes about to aſſign a reaſon, by charging them with *hereſy*, or *ſchiſm*, he unavoidably makes him Judge of ſome of the greateſt difficulties in Religion, before he can ſubmit to his Infallible Guides. He muſt know what *Neſtorianiſm*, *Eutychianiſm*, *Monotheliſm* mean, how they came to be *hereſies*, whether the Churches accuſed be juſtly charged with them? He muſt underſtand all the ſubtilties of Perſonalitie, ſubſiſtence, Hypoſtatical Union; whether

the Union of two natures in Christ be substantial, natural, or accidental? whether it be enough to say that the Divine and humane are one by inhabitation, or one by consent, or one by Communion of operation, or one by Communion of dignity and honour, all which the *Nestorians* acknowledged, only denying the union of two natures to make one Person? supposing a man be come to this, he must then be satisfied that the present *Eastern Christians* do hold the Doctrine of the old *Nestorians*, for they acknowledge Christ to be perfect God and perfect Man; and that the *B. Virgin* may be called the *Mother of the Son of God*, *or the Mother of the Word*, but they stick only at calling her *the Mother of God*. Then for the other Churches which are charged with *Eutychianism*, he must understand, the exact difference between *nature* and *Person*, for if there cannot be two natures without two Persons, then either the *Nestorians* were in the right who asserted two Persons, or the *Eytychians* who denyed two natures; but this being granted, he must be satisfied, that, those called *Jacobites* are *Eutychians*, although they disown *Eutyches*, and follow *Dioscorus*, asserting that there were two natures before the Union, and but one after; and that *Dioscorus* was rightly condemned in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*; but

sup-

ſuppoſing they are willing to leave the diſpute of two natures, on condition, that the humane nature be only made the *Inſtrument* of the *Divine* in its operations, whether they are juſtly charged with *hereſy* in ſo doing? All theſe things a Man muſt fully be ſatisfied in, before he can pronounce thoſe Churches guilty of *hereſy*, and ſo not to be followe. But ſuppoſing thoſe Churches be rejected, why muſt the *Greek*, which embraces all the *Councils* which determined thoſe ſubtle controverſies? Here comes the myſtery of the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt to be examined, whether from the Father alone or from the Father and the Son? but ſuppoſing this to be yielded, why may he not joyn with thoſe Churches, which agree with the *Church* of *Rome* in all thoſe points, as the *Proteſtant Churches* do? Here a Man muſt examine the notes of the Church, and enquire whether they be true notes, whether they agree only to the *Roman Church*? And one of the greateſt of thoſe notes being *conſent with the Primitive Church*, a Man that would be well ſatisfied, muſt go through all the diſputes between us and the Church of Rome, and by that time he is well ſettled in them, he will ſee little uſe, and leſs neceſſity of an Infallible Guide. So that a Man who would ſatisfy himſelf in this divided State of the Chriſtian

Church, what particular Communion he ought to embrace and what *Guides* he must follow, must do all that, for the preventing of which an Infallible Guide is said to be necessary. *i. e.* he must not only exercise his own judgment in particular controversies, but must proceed according to it, and joyn with that Church which upon Enquiry he judges to be the Best.

10. A prudent submission is due to the Guides of that Church, with which a person lives in Communion. Having shewed that absolute submission is not due, all that can be left is a submission within due bounds, which is that I call a prudent submission. And those bounds are these following.

1. Not to submit to all those who challenge the Authority of Guides over us, though pretending to never so much Power and Infallibility. When *N. O.* would perswade me to submit my understanding to the Infallible Guides of the Church; He must think me a very easy man to yield, till I be satisfied first that God hath appointed such to be my *Guides*, and in the next place that he hath promised Infallibility to them. And that is the true State of the Controversy between us and those of the Church of Rome in this matter; they tell us we are bound to submit to the *Guides* of the *Church*; we desire to know whom they mean by these *Guides*; and at last we understand

ſtand them to be the Biſhop of Rome and his Clergy. Here we demur, and own no Authority the Biſhop of Rome hath over us; we aſſert that we have all the *Rights* of a *Patriachal Church* within our ſelves, that we owe no account to the Biſhop of Rome of what we believe or practiſe; it is no Article of our Creed that God hath made him *Judge either of the quick or the dead*; We have Guides of our Church among our ſelves, who have as clear a ſucceſſion and as good a title as the Biſhops of any Church in the world. To theſe, who are our Lawful Guides, we promiſe a due obedience, and are blame worthy if we give it not; but for the Biſhop and Clergy of Rome, we own none to them, let them challenge it with never ſo much confidence, and arrogant pretences to Infallibility. So that here is a conteſt of *Right* in the caſe, antecedent to any duty of ſubmiſſion, which muſt be better proved than ever it hath yet been, before we can allow any diſpute, how far we are to ſubmit to the Guides of the Roman Church?

2. Not to ſubmit to thoſe who are Lawful Guides in all things they may require. For our diſpute is now about Guides ſuppoſed to be fallible, and they being owned to be ſuch may be ſuppoſed to require things to which we are bound not to yield. But the great difficulty now is, ſo to ſtate theſe things,

as to ſhew that we had reaſon not to ſubmit to the Guides of the Roman Church, and that thoſe of the Separation have no reaſon not to ſubmit to the Guides of our Church. For that is the obvious objection in this caſe, that *the ſame pretence which was uſed by our Church againſt the Church of Rome, will ſerve to juſtify all the Separations that have been or can be made from our Church.* So my Adverſary *N. O.* in his preface ſaith, *that by the principles we hold, we excuſe and juſtify all Sects which have or ſhall ſeparate from our Church.* In anſwer to which calumny I ſhall not fix upon the perſwaſion of conſcience, for that may equally ſerve for all parties; but upon a great difference in the very nature of the caſe, as will appear in theſe particulars.

1. We appeal to the Doctrine and practice of the truly Catholick Church in the matters of difference between us and the Church of Rome: we are as ready as they to ſtand to the unanimous conſent of Fathers, and to *Vincentius Lerinenſis* his Rules, of Antiquity, univerſality and conſent; we declare, let the things in diſpute be proved to have been the practice of the Chriſtian Church in all Ages, we are ready to ſubmit to them: but thoſe who ſeparate from the Church of England make this their Fundamental

mental principle as to worſhip, (wherein the difference lyes,) that nothing is Lawful in the worſhip of God, but what he hath expreſly commanded; we ſay all things are Lawful which are not forbidden, and upon this ſingle point ſtands the whole Controverſy of ſeparation as to the Conſtitution of our Church. We challenge thoſe that ſeparate from us to produce one perſon for 1500. years together, that held Forms of prayer to be unlawful; or the ceremonies which are uſed in our Church: We defend the Government of the Church by Biſhops to be the moſt ancient and Apoſtolical Government, and that no perſons can have ſufficient reaſon to caſt that off, which hath been ſo univerſally received in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles times: if there have been diſputes among us about the nature of the difference between the two orders, and the neceſſity of it in order to the Being of a Church, ſuch there have been in the Church of Rome too. Here then lyes a very conſiderable difference, we appeal and are ready to ſtand to the judgement of the Primitive Church for interpreting the letter of Scripture in any difference between us and the Church of Rome; but thoſe who ſeparate from our Church will allow nothing to be lawful but what hath an expreſs command in Scripture.

2. The Guides of our Church never challenged any Infallibility to themſelves; which thoſe of the Church of Rome do, and have done ever ſince the Controverſy began. Which challenge of Infallibility makes the Breach irreconcileable while that pretence continues; for there can be no other way but abſolute ſubmiſſion where men ſtill pretend to be infallible: It is to no purpoſe to propoſe terms of Accommodation between thoſe who contend for a Reformation, and ſuch who contend that they can never be deceived; on the one ſide, errours are ſuppoſed; and on the other, that it is impoſſible there ſhould by any. Until therefore this pretence be quitted, to talk of Accomodation is folly, and to deſign it madneſs. If the Church of Rome will allow nothing to be amiſs, how can ſhe Reform any thing? and how can they allow any thing to be amiſs, who believe they can never be deceived? So that while this Arrogant pretence of Infallibility in the Roman Church continues, it is impoſſible there ſhould be any Reconciliation: But there is no ſuch thing in the leaſt pretended by our Church, that declares in her Articles, *that General Councils may err, and ſometimes have erred even in things pertaining to God; and that all the proof of things to be believed is to be taken from Holy Scripture.* So that as to the Ground of Faith

Article 21. Articl. 3.

there

there is no difference between our Church and those who dissent from her; and none of them charge our Church with any errour in doctrine; nor plead that as the reason of their separation.

3. The Church of Rome not only requires the belief of her errours but makes the belief of them necessary to Salvation: which is plain by the often objected Creed of *Pius* 4. Wherein the same necessity is expressed of believing the additional Articles, which are proper to the Roman Church, as of the most Fundamental Articles of Christian Faith. And no Man who reads that *Bull* can discern the least difference therein made between the necessity of believing one and the other; but that all together make up that Faith, without which no man can be saved; which though only required of some persons to make profession of, yet that profession is to be esteemed the Faith of their Church. But nothing of this nature can be objected against our *Church* by dissenters, that excludes none from a possibility of Salvation meerly because not in her Communion, as the Church of Rome expresly doth: for it was not only *Boniface* 8. who determined as solemnly as he could, *that it was necessary to Salvation to be in subjection to the Bishop of Rome*; but the *Council* of *Lateran* under *Leo* 10. decreed the same thing. Concil. Lateran. A. D. 1516. sect. 11.

4. The

4. The Guides of the Roman Church pretend to as immediate authority of obliging the Conſciences of men, as Chriſt or his Apoſtles had; but ours challenge no more than teaching men to do what Chriſt had Commanded them, and in other things, not commanded or forbidden, to give rules, which on the account of the General Commands of Scripture, they look on the members of our Church as obliged to obſerve. So that the Authority challenged in the Roman Church encroaches on the Prerogative of Chriſt, being of the ſame nature with his; but that which our Governours plead for, is only that which belongs to them as Governours over a Chriſtian Society. Hence in the Church of Rome it is accounted as much a mortal ſin to diſobey their Guides in the moſt indifferent things, as to diſobey God in the plain Commands of Scripture: but that is not all they challenge to themſelves, but a power likewiſe to diſpence with the Law's of God, as in matter of marriages, and with the Inſtitution of Chriſt as in Communion in one kind; and promiſe the ſame ſpiritual effects to their own Inſtitutions as to thoſe of Chriſt, as in the 5. Sacraments they have added to the two of Chriſt, and to other ceremonies in uſe among them.

5. Setting aſide theſe conſiderations, we dare appeal to the judgement of any perſon of

of what perſwaſion ſoever, whether the reaſons we plead for ſeparation from the Church of Rome be not in themſelves far more conſiderable than thoſe, which are pleaded by ſuch, who ſeparate from our Church? *i. e.* Whether our Churches impoſing of three Ceremonies declared to be indifferent by thoſe who require them, can be thought by any men of common ſenſe ſo great a burden to their Conſciences, as all the load of ſuperſtitious fopperies in the Roman Church? whether praying by a preſcribed form of words be as contrary to Scripture, as praying in an unknown tongue? Whether there be no difference between kneeling at the Sacrament upon Proteſtants Principles and the Papiſts adoration of the Hoſt? Whether Tranſubſtantiation, Image worſhip, Invocation of Saints, Indulgences, Purgatory, the Popes ſupremacy, be not ſomewhat harder things to ſwallow, than the Churches power to appoint matters of order and decency? Which particulars make the difference ſo apparent between the ſeparation of our Church from the Church of Rome, and that of diſſenters from our Church; that it ſeems a very ſtrange thing to me that this ſhould be objected by our Enemies on either ſide. And thus much may ſuffice to clear this point of ſubmiſſion to the Guides of a Church, of which I have the more

more largely discoursed, not for any difficulty objected by *N. O.* but because the thing it self did deserve to be more amply considered. But some other things relating to Church-Authority I must handle afterwards, and therefore now return to my Adversary.

§. 11. Of the sense of Scripture.

The next thing to be debated is, what assurance we can have of the sense of Scripture in doubtful places, if we allow no Infallible Guides to interpret them? For that is the second main principle of *N. O. that without this Infallible Assistance of the Guides of the Church, there can be no certainty of the sense of Scripture.* And it is chiefely on this Account that *N. O.* doth assert the necessity of Infallible Guides of the Church: For as appears by his concessions he yields
P. 37. that the Churches *Infallibility is not necessary to the foundation of faith*; for men *faith*, he saith, *may begin at the Infallible Authority of Scriptures*; but the main ground on which he contends for the necessity of Infallible Guides is for the interpretation of controverted places and giving the true sense
P. 6. 14. of Scripture: for which he often pleads for necessity of an external Infallible Guide.
P. 47. *Because God hath referred all in the dubious sense of Scripture to the direction of his Ministers their spiritual Guides, whom he hath*

set

ſet over them to bring them in the Vnity of the Faith to a perfect man; and that they may not be toſſed to and fro and carried about with every wind of Doctrine, by the ſleight of thoſe who lye in wait to deceive. And without which Guide St. Peter *obſerves, that in his time ſome perſons (for any thing we know diligent enough) yet through want of learning, and the inſtability of adhering to their Guides, being unlearned,* ſaith he, *and unſtable, wreſted ſome places of Scripture, hard to be underſtood, to their own deſtruction. Therefore theſe Scriptures are alſo in ſome great and important points hard to be underſtood. And afterwards,* he ſaith, *that Chriſtians who have ſufficient certainty of the truth of Chriſtianity, may be deficient in a right belief of ſeveral neceſſary Articles of this Chriſtian Faith, if deſtitute of that external infallible Guide therein: without which he determines that men muſt fluctuate and totter, and vary one from another, whilſt the Scriptures are ambiguous in their ſenſe and drawn with much art to ſeveral Intereſts.* The force of all which, comes to this, that we can arrive at no certainty of the ſenſe of Scripture in Controverted places, without an external Infallible Guide: and therefore we are bound to ſubmit to him.

Ephes. 4. 11, 13, 14.

2 Pet. 3. 16.

P. 67.

Here are two things to be diſcuſſed.

1. What

1. What neceſſity there is for the Salvation of perſons, to have an infallible interpretation of controverted places of Scripture? 2. Whether the denying ſuch an Infallible Interpreter makes men uncapable of attaining any certain ſenſe of doubtful places? For if either it be not neceſſary that men ſhould have an infallible interpretation; or men may attain at a certain ſenſe without it, then there can be no colour of an argument drawn from hence to prove the neceſſity of an infallible Guide.

1. We are to enquire into the neceſſity of ſuch an infallible interpretation of doubtful places of Scripture. There are but three grounds on which it can be thought neceſſary, either that no man ſhould miſtake in the ſenſe of Scripture, or that the Peace of the Church cannot be preſerved, or that mens Souls cannot be ſaved without it. If it were neceſſary on the firſt account, then every particular perſon muſt be infallible; which being not pleaded for, we muſt conſider the other two grounds of it. But here we are to take notice, that the matter of our preſent enquiry is concerning the clearneſs of Scripture in order to the Salvation of particular perſons; of which the Propoſition laid down by me expreſly ſpeaks. If therefore N. O. do any thing to overthrow this, he muſt

prove

prove, not that there are doubtful and controverted places which no one denies, but that the ſenſe of Scripture is ſo doubtful and obſcure in the things which are neceſſary to mens Salvation, that perſons without an Infallible Guide cannot know the meaning of them. If he prove not this, he doth not come near that which he ought to prove. We do not therefore deny, that there are places of great difficulty in the Books of Scripture; but we aſſert, that the neceſſaries to Salvation do not lye therein; but thoſe being plain and clear, men may be ſaved without knowing the other. As a Seaman may ſafely direct his compaſs by the Stars, although he cannot ſolve all the difficulties of Aſtronomy. Can any man in his ſenſes Imagine that Chriſts coming into the world to dye for ſinners, and the precepts of a holy life which he hath given, and the motives thereto from his ſecond coming to Judge the World, are not more plain than the Apocalyphical viſions, or the proofs for the Church of Romes Infallibility? If a perſon then by reading and conſidering thoſe things which are plain, may do what Chriſt requires for his Salvation; what neceſſity hath ſuch a one to trouble himſelf about an Infallible Guide? For either he may go to heaven without him, or not? if he may, let them ſhew the neceſſity

he

he is of to that end, which may be attained without him; if not, then the things neceſſary to Salvation cannot be known without him. Let this be proved, and I will immediately yield the whole cauſe: and till it be proved my Principles remain unſhaken. But ſaith *N. O. the Scripture is obſcure in ſome great and important points, becauſe S.* Peter *ſaith, that men unlearned and unſtable, (though it may be diligent enough) wreſted ſome places of Scriptures hard to be underſtood to their own deſtruction.* But doth S. *Peter* ſay that *the Scriptures are ſo hard to be underſtood* that ſober and devout minds cannot learn therein, what is neceſſary to their Salvation? This had been indeed to their purpoſe: but it is far enough from St. *Peters.* He only ſaith that *in St.* Pauls *Epiſtles there are ſome difficult paſſages*, which men that wanted judgement and conſtancy, and it may be diligence too, were ready to pervert to their own miſchief. But if there be ſuch difficulties, is there nothing plain and eaſy? if bad men may pervert them, may not good men make a good uſe of them? If ſome may deſtroy themſelves by their own weakneſs and folly, may not others be ſaved by their diligence and care? If it were proved by *N. O.* that St. *Peter* charged all this upon them for want of adhering to their Guides,

that

that would approach nearer his buſineſs; but if St. *Peter* had intended any ſuch thing as *N. O.* inſinuates, what fairer opportunity had there been of preventing this Inſtability in others by telling them, that God had appointed infallible Guides in his Church to prevent ſuch abuſes of Scripture, and that, ſo long as they adhered to them, they were ſafe; but there is not the leaſt word in St. *Peter* to this purpoſe, when it had been moſt neceſſary to have given ſuch advice; but he only bids them, have a care of *imitating the inconſtancy of ſuch wicked men, and grow in the grace and knowledge of Jeſus Chriſt.* If on ſo fair and juſt an occaſion offered, St. *Peter* himſelf whom they believe to have been Head of the Church at that time, and at Rome at the writing of this Epiſtle, doth wholly omit referring men in the ſenſe of obſcure places to Infallible Guides; what can we elſe infer but that St. *Peter* knew of no ſuch appointment of Chriſt, or thought no ſuch thing of neceſſity for his Church. For if he had, ſuch was his care and faithfulneſs, he would never have omitted ſo neceſſary a thing; if the Salvation of mens ſouls had depended upon it.

2 Pet 3. 17, 18.

If it be not then neceſſary to mens Salvation to have an infallible Interpretation of

§ 12. Of a Judge of Controverſies.

doubtful places; for what other end can it become neceſſary? Is it, *that without this, the Churches peace cannot be preſerved, becauſe Controverſies ariſing in the Church, no iſſue can be put to them, unleſs there be an infallible Judge to determine which is the true ſence of Scripture? For it is impoſſible That Scripture it ſelf ſhould be judge, becauſe the Controverſy is about* the ſenſe of Scripture. So that either *there is no way left to determine Controverſies, or there muſt be an infallible judge to deliver the ſenſe of Scripture in doubtful places.* This is the force of all that I know can be ſaid in this matter; to which I anſwer.

1. The ſtrength of this argument depends upon the ſuppoſition of the neceſſity of determining Controverſies in Religion by a living Judge, who muſt pronounce ſentence between the parties in difference. Which ſuppoſition, how plauſible ſoever it ſeems, is not built on any ſufficient foundation of Scripture or Reaſon. For the weakneſs of humane underſtanding, the power of Intereſt and paſſion, and the ambiguity of words, are as apt to beget diſputes in Religion as in any other things; ſo that we have no cauſe at all to wonder that there ſhould happen to be Controverſies among men about theſe matters; when we ſee them daily happen about the Laws of every

every Country. The only Queſtion now is, whether as the neceſſities of people have made it neceſſary that there ſhould not only be Laws but Judges, who ſhould be as the moſt equal Arbitrators to put an end to ſuch differences as may happen among men about matters of Right and Law, it be thus in Religion too? And this Queſtion is plainly about a matter of Fact *i. e.* whether Chriſt hath appointed ſuch Judges in all Ages, who are to determine all emergent Controverſies about the difficult places of his Law? And in this caſe we think it is all the reaſon in the World, that they who *Affirm* ſhould *Prove*, eſpecially, when they Affirm a matter of their own Right, and challenge a ſubmiſſion from others on the Account of it. We deſire them who challenge to be our infallible Guides, that they would ſhew their Commiſſion, and produce their Patent: For as we are ready to yield *obedience*, if they crave it, ſo we think it Treaſon and Tyranny in them to uſurp it, if they have it not. And it is to no purpoſe to talk of the Benefits that would come to the world by an infallible Judge of Controverſies, unleſs they firſt prove that there is one. But we muſt not allow men to prove things to be, meerly becauſe they think it fitting they ſhould be; for that is to make themſelves Wiſer than Chriſt and rather

to tell him what he ſhould have done, than prove what he hath done. What if Chriſt having provided for the neceſſaries of Salvation by a clear Revelation ſhould leave other things in the dark, to exerciſe the Wits of ſome and the Charity of others? What if, he thought it ſufficient to oblige men to the greateſt honeſty and Integrity in knowing and doing the Will of God, and hath promiſed to paſs by the errours and failings men are ſubject to barely as men? What if, he foreſaw this matter of ending Controverſies would be an occaſion of raiſing one of the greateſt in the Chriſtian World, and become a pretence of the moſt intolerable Tyranny over the minds of men? And therefore what if, he thought it reaſonable to leave the failings of mens underſtandings and lives upon the ſame terms, ſo as to give ſufficient means to prevent either, but not effectually to hinder men from falling into either of them? What if, the nature of Religion will not bear ſuch a determination of Controverſies as civil matters will? becauſe, civil matters concern the right and wrong of particular perſons, in which it is not the ſentence of the Judge ſo much as the Civil force whereby it is backed which puts an end to the diſpute; but in matters of Religion, the ending Controverſies can be no effect of force

and power, but of reaſon and conviction of Conſcience; and all the pretended infallibility in the World can never ſatisfy my mind, unleſs I be firſt aſſured of that infallibility. In all civil cauſes, it is agreed on both ſides that ſuch Judges are appointed to determine caſes of Law; and on the ſuppoſition of this men proceed to tryal before them; but in our caſe this is the main thing in diſpute, and he that pretends to be the Judge is the moſt accuſed partie, and what reaſon can there be, that only on the pretence of greater peace, if Controverſies were referred to an infallible Judge, we muſt therefore allow every one that pretends to it to be ſuch an infallible Guide? And we muſt on the ſame ground allow every one, if we muſt not firſt be ſatisfied of the grounds on which it is challenged by any one. And withal, ſince Chriſt is the beſt Judge of what is fitteſt for his Church, we muſt ſee by his Laws whether he hath made it neceſſary for all Controverſies to be ended by a ſtanding Judge, that ſhould ariſe about the ſenſe of Scripture? If he hath not done it, it is to no purpoſe to ſay, it is fit he ſhould have done it; for that is to upbraid Chriſt with weakneſs and not to end differences in his Church.

2. Suppoſing it neceſſary that Controver-

ſies ſhould be ended, it may as well be done without an infallible Judge of the ſenſe of Scripture as with one; for all that is pretended to be done by an infallible Judge is to give a certain ſenſe of controverted places; ſo that men are either bound to look on that which they give as the certain ſenſe on the account of the infallibility of the Interpreter, or that ſuch an infallible interpretation being ſet aſide, there is no way to know the certain ſenſe of Scripture. If the firſt, then no man can be more certain of the ſenſe of any doubtful place, than he is of the infallibility of his Interpreter: I deſire therefore to be reſolved in this caſe. I am told *I can arrive at no certainty of the ſenſe of doubtful places of Scripture without an infallible Interpreter*, I ſay the places of Scripture which are alledged for ſuch an infallible Judge are the moſt doubtful and controverted of any; I would fain underſtand by what means I may come to be certain of the meaning of theſe places, and to find out the ſenſe of them? Muſt I do it only by an infallible Guide? but that is the thing I am now ſeeking for, and I muſt not ſuppoſe that which I am to prove. If I may be certain without ſuppoſing ſuch an infallible Guide, of the meaning of theſe very doubtful and controverted places, than why may I not by

by the same way of proceeding arrive at the certainty of any other less doubtful and obscure places? unless there be some private way to come at the sense of those places which will hold for none else besides them, which is not so easy to understand.

2. I come therefore to the second enquiry, which is about the means of attaining the certain sense of Scripture in doubtful places, without the supposition of an infallible Guide. It will not I hope be denyed, that the Primitive Christian Church had a certain way of understanding the sense of doubtful places, as far as it was necessary to be understood, and that they wanted no means which Christ had appointed for the ending of Controversies. But I shall now shew, that they proceeded by no other means than what we use, so that, if they had any means to come to a certain sense of Scripture, we have the same; and it would be a very hard case if by the use of the same means we cannot attain the same end. I shall therefore give an account of the proceeding of the Primitive Church in this weighty Controversy concerning the sense of Scripture in doubtful places; and if no such thing was then heard off as an infallible Judge, it is a plain demonstration, they thought there was none appointed, because the disputes that happened

then required as much the Authority of such a Judge as any that are at this day in the Christian Church.

§ 13. The way used in the Primitive Church for finding the sense of Scripture

In the first Ages of Christianity, there were two sorts of Controversies which disturbed the Church; one was concerning the Authority of the Books of the new Testament, and the other concerning the sense of them. For, there was no one Book of the New Testament whose Authority was not called in Question, by some Hereticks in those first Ages. The *Gnosticks*, (by whom I understand the followers of *Simon Magus*, *Menander*, *Saturninus* and *Basilides*), had framed a new Religion of their own under the name of *Christian*, and had no regard to the Writings either of the old or new Testament, but had a Book of their own, which they called the *Gospel of Perfection*. But as *Epiphanius* well observes, *no man that hath understanding, needs Scripture to refute such a Religion as theirs was; for right reason alone was sufficient to discover the folly and filthyness of it.* The followers of *Cerinthus* and *Ebion* acknowledged no other Gospel but that of St. *Matthew*; and that not entire, but with diverse corruptions and interpolations according to their several fancies. *Cerdon* and *Marcion* allowed no Gospel but

Epiphan. hæres. 26. sect. 2. 3.

Epiphan. Hæres. 28. 30. Iren. l. 1. c. 26.

but that of St. *Luke*, which they altered according to their pleaſure, cutting off the Genealogy and other places, and inſerting many things as it ſerved moſt to their purpoſe, as may be ſeen at large in *Epiphanius*. Some ſay, the *Valentinians* received no other *Goſpel* but that of St. *John*, (as the *Alogi* in *Epiphanius* rejected that alone,) but I do not find that *Valentinus* did reject any, but added more; for *Irenæus* chargeth the *Valentinians* only with adding another *Goſpel*, which they called the *Goſpel* of *Truth*; and *Tertullian* expreſly ſaith, that *Valentinus therein differed from* Marcion, *that* Marcion *cut off what he pleaſed with his ſword*, *but* Valentinus *corrupted it with his pen*; *for although he allowed all the Books of the New Teſtament, yet he perverted the meaning of them.* *Euſebius* tells us *that the followers of* Severus *rejected the* Epiſtles *of S.* Paul *and the* Acts *of the* Apoſtles; *and interpreted the Law, and the Prophets and the Goſpels after a peculiar ſenſe of their own.* So that we ſee thoſe who undertook to confute theſe Hereticks were not only to vindicate the true ſenſe of Scripture, but to diſpute with ſuch, who did not own the ſame Books which they did; and therefore were forced to uſe ſuch ways of arguing as were proper to them: as may be ſeen at large by the proceedings of *Irenæus*, and

c. 29. *L.* 3. *c.* 11.

Epiphan. hær. 42.

Iren l. 3. *c.* 11.

Tertull. de præcip hæret. c. 38.

Euſeb. hiſt. Eccleſ l. 4. *c.* 29.

and *Tertullian* againſt them. But becauſe the *Valentinians* and *Marcionites* did endeavour to ſuit their extravagant fancies to the Scriptures allowed by them, it will be neceſſary for us, to enquire by what means they went about to clear the true ſenſe of Scripture from their falſe Gloſſes and Interpretations. *Irenæus* in the beginning of his Book, relating at large the Doctrines of the *Valentinians*, ſaith, *that by the perverſe interpretations and corrupt expoſitions of the Scripture, they drew away unſtable minds from the true faith; for they pretended to find out deeper and more myſterious things in the Scripture, than others were acquainted with*, viz. *That Chriſt intimated the* 30. *Æöns by not appearing till the* 30. *year of his Age. That the parable of men called at the firſt, the third, the ſixth, the ninth, the eleventh hour referred to the ſame thing, for thoſe hours make up the number of* 30. *That St.* Paul *often mentions theſe Æöns and the productions of them; that the duodecade of Æöns was implyed in our Saviours diſputing with the Doctors at* 12. *years of Age, and in the choice of the* 12. *Apoſtles: and the remaining* 18. By his *abiding* 18. *months as they ſaid with his Diſciples after his reſurrection: and where ever in Scripture they met with words ſuitable to the deſcription of their Æöns, they pretended that*

Iren. l. 1. *c.* 1.

that they did refer to their notions, but were obſcurely expreſſed on purpoſe: for which end they made uſe of Parables, and the firſt of St. John *and many paſſages in St.* Pauls *Epiſtles.* What courſe now doth *Irenæus* take to clear the ſenſe of Scripture in theſe controverted places? Doth he till them that God had appointed Infallible Guides in his Church, to whom appeal was to be made in all ſuch caſes? Nothing like it, through his whole Book; but he argues with very good reaſon that no ſuch thing as they imagined could be intended by the Scripture.

1. From the ſcope and deſign of the Scripture, which ought chiefly to be regarded; whereas they only took ſome particular paſſages which ſerved moſt to their purpoſe, without looking to the ſeries of the diſcourſe wherein they were. "Therefore ſaith he, "they make only a rope of ſand, when they "apply the Parables of our Saviour, or the "ſayings of the Prophets or Apoſtles to their "opinions; for they paſs over the order and "connexion of the Scriptures; and as much "as in them lyes looſe the members of truth "from each other; and then transform and "change them from one thing to another, "thereby deceiving men. As if, ſaith he, "a man ſhould take an excellent Image of a "Prince, done with a great deal of art in pre-

Iren. l. 1. c. 1.

"tious

" tious ſtones; and remove thoſe ſtones out
" of their proper places and turn them into
" the ſhape of a Dog or a Fox, ill put toge-
" ther, and ſhould then affirm, that becauſe
" the ſtones are the ſame, that this Image of
" a Dog or a Fox, was the Image of the
" Prince made by ſuch an excellent Artiſt:
" after the very ſame way, ſaith he, do
" they uſe the Scriptures. Or as he after-
" wards expreſſeth it, they take ſeveral
" words and names here and there, and put
" them together, much after the way of thoſe
" who would apply the words of *Homer* to
" any argument propoſed to them; which
" ſome have done ſo artificially, that un-
" skilful men have been perſwaded that *Ho-*
" *mer* did mean that very thing when he
" wrote his Poem. As one did the going
" of *Hercules* to *Cerberus* ſo exactly in the
" words of *Homer*, (put together in the
" *Greek* fragments of *Irenæus*,) that thoſe
" who did not conſider upon what different
" occaſions thoſe words were uſed by him,
" ſome being ſpoken of *Ulyſſes*, ſome of
" *Priamus*, ſome of *Mænelaus*, and *Aga-*
" *memnon*, and ſome of *Hercules*, might
" Imagine that the Poet intended to deſcribe
" what the other expreſſed by him. But he
" that will examine the ſeveral places will find
" that the words indeed are *Homers*, but the
" ſenſe

"ſenſe his that ſo applyed them. So it is in "this caſe, the words are the Scriptures, "but applyed quite in another way, than "they were intended; the ſtones are the "ſame, but yet the Image of the Fox is "not to be taken for that of the Prince: and "when he hath taken the pains to put every "thing in its proper and due place, he will "then eaſily find out the deceit. And by the help of this rule *Irenæus* vindicates the places of Scripture, which the *Valentinians* made uſe of; and makes it evident that could not be the ſenſe of them which they put upon them. As he doth particularly prove that St. *John* by the beginning of his Goſpel could not mean the firſt *Ogdoad* of the *Valentinians*. To the very ſame purpoſe doth *Tertullian* argue againſt their way of interpreting *Scripture*; "That although it ſeems "to have wit and eaſineſs in it, yet it is no "more than is often practiſed on *Virgil* and "*Homer* as well as the Scriptures. For we "have ſeen *Virgil*, ſaith he, with the ſame "words turned quite to another ſenſe; as "*Hoſtidius Geta* made the Tragœdy of *Medea*, "out of *Virgil* (ſome fragments whereof "are ſtill extant) and one had explained "*Cebes* his Table in *Virgils* words; and many "had applyed the words of *Homer* in their "*Cento's* to different purpoſes, and not only ſome

Tertull. de præſcrip. hæret. c. 39.

Pet. Scriverii fragmata vv Tragicorum. p. 187.

Isidor. Orig. l. 1. c. 38. some of late, but *Isidore* faith, that *Probus* and *Pomponius* before his time had made *Virgil* Evangelize. "Therefore it is no "wonder, ſaith *Tertullian*, that the Scri- "pture ſhould be ſo abuſed, it being much "more fruitful, and applicable to ſeveral "purpoſes than other Writings are. Nay "ſaith he, I am not afraid to ſay, that the "Scriptures were ſo framed by the Will of "God, that they might afford matter for "Hereticks to work upon; ſince I read that "there muſt be hereſies, which cannot be "without the Scripture. And ſurely then, he did not Imagine that God had appointed an infallible Judge on purpoſe to prevent the being of Hereſies, by giving an infallible ſenſe of Scripture.

2. From the repugnancy of the ſence they gave to other places of Scripture. "*Irenæus* Iren. l. 2. c. 46. "obſerves, that the Hereticks delighted "moſt in dark places, and left the plain ones; "whereas we ought moſt to rely upon the "plain places and by them interpret the "obſcure. For ſuch who loved God and the "truth would ſtudy moſt thoſe things which "God put under our command and know- "ledge: and thoſe are things which are plain "before our eyes, and are open and without "ambiguity laid down in Scriptures; and "to theſe Parables and dark places ought to "be

"be fitted, and by this means they may be "interpreted without danger, and of all "alike, and the body of truth remains entire "with a ſuitableneſs of all its parts. But "without this every man interprets as he "pleaſes, and there will be no certain rule "of Truth; but every interpretation will be "according to the opinion of the Interpreter, "and men will contradict each other as the "Philoſophers did. And by this means "men will be always ſeeking and never fin- "ding becauſe they caſt away the means of "finding. Seeing therefore, ſaith he, that "all the Scriptures both Prophetical and "Evangelical are plain and clear, and may "be heard alike of all: they muſt be very "blind that will not ſee in ſo great light, but "darken themſelves in Parables, wherein "every one of them thinks he hath found a "God of his own. And from hence he very "much blames the Hereticks, ſince they "could not ſo much as pretend that any thing "was plainly ſaid for them in Scripture, "but only intimated in dark ſayings and pa- "rables, that they would leave that which "is certain and undoubted and true, for that "which was uncertain and obſcure. Which, "he ſaith, is not to build the houſe upon "the firm and ſtrong rock; but upon the "uncertainty of the ſand; on which it may

"be

" be eaſily overturned. This excellent rule " for interpreting Scripture *Irenæus* makes " great uſe of in his following diſcourſe, and " in the very next Chapter urges this as the " Conſequence of it, that having truth for " our Rule, and ſo plain Teſtimony of God, " men ought not to perplex themſelves with " doubtful Queſtions concerning God, but " grow in the love of him who hath done and " doth ſo great things for us, and never fall " off from that knowledge which is moſt " clearly revealed. And we ought to be con- " tent with what is clearly made known in " the Scriptures, becauſe they are perfect, " as coming from the word and Spirit of God. " And we need not wonder if there be ma- " ny things in Religion above our under- " ſtandings, ſince there are ſo in natural " things which are daily ſeen by us: as in " the nature of Birds, Water, Air, Meteors, " &c. of which we may talk much, but " only God knows what the truth is. There- " fore why ſhould we think much if it be ſo " in Religion too? wherein are ſome things " we may underſtand and others we muſt " leave to God, and if we do ſo we ſhall keep " our faith without danger. And all Scri- " pture being agreeable to it ſelf, the dark " places muſt be underſtood in a way moſt " ſuitable to the ſenſe of the plain.

3. The

3. The ſenſe they gave of Scripture was contrary to the Doctrine of faith received by all true Chriſtians from the beginning: which he calls "the unmoveable rule of *Iren. l. 1.* "faith received in Baptiſm; and which the *c. 1.* "Church diſperſed over the Earth did equal- "ly receive in all places; with a wonderful *c. 2.* "conſent. For although the places and "languages be never ſo diſtant or different *c. 3.* "from each other, yet the faith is the very "ſame as there is one Sun which inlightens "the whole World; which faith none did "enlarge or diminiſh. And after having "ſhewn the great abſurdities of the Doctrines "of the Enemies of this faith, in his firſt and "ſecond Books, in the beginning of the "third he ſhews that the Apoſtles did fully *l. 3. c. 1.* "underſtand the mind of Chriſt, that they "preached the ſame Doctrine which the "Church received, and which, after their "preaching it, was committed to writing by "the Will of God in the Scriptures, to be "the pillar and ground of Faith. Which "was the true reaſon why the Hereticks did *c. 2.* "go about to diſparage the Scriptures be- "cauſe they were condemned by them: "therefore they would not allow them ſuffi- "cient Authority, and charged them with "contradictions, and ſo great obſcurity that "the truth could not be found in them with-

" out the help of Tradition, which they ac-
" counted the key to unlock all the difficulties
" of Scripture. And was not to be ſought
" for in Writings, but was delivered down
" from hand to hand; for which cauſe St.
" *Paul* ſaid we ſpeak wiſdom among them
" that are perfect. Which wiſdom they
" pretended to be among themſelves. On
" this account the matter of Tradition came
" firſt into diſpute in the Chriſtian Church:
c. 3. " and *Irenæus* appeals to the moſt eminent
" Churches and Eſpecially that of *Rome*,
" becauſe of the great reſort of Chriſtians
" thither, whether any ſuch tradition was
" ever received among them and all the
" Churches of *Aſia* received the ſame faith
" from the Apoſtles, and knew of no ſuch
c. 4. " Tradition as the *Valentinians* pretended
" to. And there was no reaſon to think,
" that ſo many Churches, founded by the
" Apoſtles or Chriſt, ſhould be ignorant of
" ſuch a tradition; and ſuppoſing no Scri-
" ptures at all had been written by the A-
" poſtles, we muſt then have followed the
" Tradition of the moſt ancient and Apoſto-
" lical Churches, and even the moſt Barba-
" rous nations that had embraced Chriſtiani-
" ty without any Writings: yet fully agreed
" with other Churches in the Doctrine of
" Faith, for that is it he means by the *rule* of
" *faith*,

"*faith*, viz. a ſummary comprehenſion of the Doctrine received among Chriſtians, ſuch as the Creed is mentioned by *Irenæus*; and afterwards he ſpeaks of the *Rule* of the *Valentinians* in oppoſition to that of the ſound Chriſtians. From hence *Irenæus* proceeds to confute the Doctrine of the *Valentinians* by Scripture and Reaſon in the third, fourth and fifth Books: All which ways of finding out the ſenſe of Scripture in doubtful places, we allow of and approve; and are always ready to appeal to them in any of the matters controverted between us and the Church of Rome. But *Irenæus* knew nothing of any Infallible Judge to determine the ſenſe of Scripture, for if he had, it would have been very ſtrange he ſhould have gone ſo much the fartheſt way about, when he might ſo eaſily have told the *Valentinians* that God had entruſted the Guides of his Church, eſpecially at *Rome* with the faculty of interpreting Scripture, and that all men were bound to believe that to be the ſenſe of it which they declared and no other. But men muſt be pardoned if they do not write that which never entred into their Heads. After *Irenæus*, *Tertullian* ſets himſelf the moſt to diſpute againſt thoſe who oppoſed the *Faith* of the *Church*; and the method he takes in his *Boo* of *Præ-*

L. 1. 6. 2.

L. 4. Præfat.

L. 5. Præfat.

ſcription of *Hereticks* is this.

Tertull. de præſcript hæret. c. 8. 1. That there muſt be a certain unalterable *Rule* of *Faith*. "For he that believes, "doth not only ſuppoſe ſufficient grounds "for his faith, but bounds that are ſet to it; "and therefore there is no need of further "ſearch ſince the Goſpel is revealed. This "he ſpeaks to take away the pretence of the c. 9. "*Seekers* of thoſe days, who were always "crying, *ſeek and ye ſhall find*: to which "he replys, that we are to conſider not "the bare words, but the reaſon of them; "And in the firſt place we are to ſuppoſe this, "that there is one certain and fixed Doctrine "delivered by Chriſt which all nations are "bound to believe, and therefore to ſeek, "that when they have found they may be- c. 10 "lieve it. Therefore all our enquiries are to "be confined within that compaſs; what that "Doctrine was, which Chriſt delivered: for "otherwiſe there will be no end of ſeeking.

2. "He ſhews what this *Rule* of *Faith* is, "by repeating the Articles of the Ancient "Creed, which he ſaith was univerſally, "received among true Chriſtians and diſpu- c. 13. "ted by none but Hereticks. Which *Rule* "of *Faith* being embraced, then he ſaith, "a liberty is allowed for other enquiries in "doubtful or obſcure matters. For faith c. 14 "lyes in the Rule; but other things were

matters

"matters of skill and curiosity; and it is faith "which saves men, and not their skill in "expounding Scriptures: and while men keep "themselves within that Rule, they are safe "enough, for to know nothing beyond it, "is to know all.

3. ***But they pretend Scripture for what they deliver, and by that means unsettle the minds of many.*** To this he answers several ways.

1. "That such persons as those were, "ought not to be admitted to a dispute con- "cerning the sense of Scripture; because "they rather deserved to be censured than "disputed, for bringing such new heresies "into the Church; but chiefly because it c. 16. "was to no purpose to dispute with them a- "bout the sense of Scripture, who received "what Scriptures they pleased themselves, "and added and took away as they thought "fit. And what can the most skilful men in c. 17. "the Scripture, do with such men, who "deny or affirm what they please? there- "fore such kind of disputes tended to no "good at all, where either side charged the c. 18. "other with forging and perverting the Scri- "ptures, and so the Controversy with them, "was not to be managed by the Scriptures, "by which either none, or an uncertain Vi- "ctory was to be obtained.

2. "In this diſpute about the ſenſe of
"Scripture, the true Ancient faith is firſt to
"be enquired after, for among whom that
"was, there would appear to be the true
c. 19. "meaning of Scripture. And for finding
"out the true faith, we are to remember,
"that, Chriſt ſent abroad his Apoſtles to
"plant Churches in every City, from whence
c. 20. "other Churches did derive the faith, which
"are called Apoſtolical from their agreement
"in this common faith at firſt delivered by
"the Apoſtles; that, the way to under-
c. 21. "ſtand this Apoſtolical faith is to have re-
"courſe to the Apoſtolical Churches; for
"it is unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that the Apo-
"ſtles ſhould not know the Doctrine of
c. 22. "Chriſt, (which he at large proves) or
c. 23.
c. 24. "that they did not deliver to the Churches
c. 25. "planted by them the things which they
c. 26.
c. 27. "knew; or that the Churches miſunderſtood
"their Doctrine becauſe all the Chriſtian
"Churches were agreed in one Common
c. 28. "faith: and therefore there is all the reaſon
"to believe that ſo univerſal conſent muſt
"ariſe from ſome common cauſe, which can
"be ſuppoſed to be no other than the com-
"mon delivery of it by all the Apoſtles. But
"the Doctrines of the Hereticks were novel
c. 29. "and upſtart; and we muſt ſay all the for-
"mer Chriſtians were baptized into a falſe
"faith,

"faith, as not knowing the true God or "the true Chriſt if *Marcion* and *Valentinus* c. 30.
"did deliver the true Doctrine, but that "which is firſt is true and from God, that "which comes after is foraign and falſe. If "*Marcion* and *Valentinus*, *Nigidius* or "*Hermogenes* broach new opinions and ſet "up other expoſitions of Scripture than the "Chriſtian Church hath received from the "Apoſtles times, that without any farther "proof, diſcovers their impoſture.

3. Two ſenſes directly contrary to each other cannot proceed from the ſame Apoſtolical perſons. This *Tertullian* likewiſe inſiſts upon to ſhew that although they might pretend Antiquity, and that as far as the Apoſtolical times, yet the contrariety of their Doctrine to that of the Apoſtles would ſufficiently manifeſt the falſhood of it. For ſaith he, "the Apoſtles would never contradict "each other or themſelves; and if the Apo- c. 32.
"ſtolical perſons had contradicted them, "they had not been joyned together in the "Communion of the ſame faith; which all "the Apoſtolical Churches were. But the "Doctrines broached by theſe men, were in "their ſeeds condemned by the Apoſtles "themſelves; ſo *Marcion*, *Apelles*, and c. 33.
"*Valentinus* were confuted in the *Sadducees*, "and firſt corrupters of Chriſtianity. But

"the true Christians could not be charged
"by their Adversaries with holding any thing
"contrary to what the Church received from
"the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ,
"and Christ from God. For the succession
"of the Churches was so evident, and the
c. 36. "*Chairs* of the *Apostles* so well known, that
c. 37. "any one might satisfy his curiosity about
"their Doctrine, especially since their au-
"thentick Epistles are still preserved therein.
"But where a diversity of Doctrine was
"found from the Apostles, that was suffi-
"cient evidence of a false sense that was put
"upon the Scriptures. Thus *Tertullian*
lays down the rules of finding out the sense
of controverted places of Scripture, without
the least insinuation of any infallibility
placed in the Guides of the Church for deter-
mining the certain sense of them.

But lest by this way of *Prescribing* against *Hereticks*, he should seem to decline the merits of the cause out of distrust of being able to manage it against them, he tells us therefore elsewhere he would set aside the ground of *prescription*, or just exception against their pleading, (for so *prescription* signifies in him) as against *Marcion* and *Hermogenes* and *Praxeas* and refute their opinions upon other grounds. In his Books against *Marcion*, he

he first lays down *Marcions rule*, as he calls it, *i. e.* the sum of his opinion, which was making the Creator of the World, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ two distinct Gods, the one nothing but goodness, and the other, the Author of evil: which opinion he overthrows from principles of reason, because there cannot be "two infinitely great, and "on the same grounds he makes two he may "make many more, and because God must "be known by his works, and he could not be "God that did not create the World; and "so continues arguing against *Marcion* to "the end of the first Book. In the second "he vindicates God the Creator from all the "objections which *Marcion* had mustered "against his goodness. In the third he pro- "ves that Christ was the Son of God the "Creator; first by reason and then by Scri- "pture, and lays down two rules for under- "standing the Prophetical predictions relat- "ing to the manner of expressing future things "as past, and the ænigmatical way of re- "presenting plain things: afterwards he "proves in the same manner from Scripture "and Reason, that Christ did truly assume "our nature and not meerly in appearance; "which he demonstrates from the death and "resurrection of Christ and from the evidence "of sence; and makes that sufficient evidence

Tertull. c. Mar. l. 1. c. 2. c. 4. 5. 6. c. 11. 12. l. 3. c. 5. c. 8. 9.

"of

" of the truth of a body that it is the object of " three ſenſes, of ſight, and touch and hearing. Which is the ſame way of arguing we make uſe of againſt Tranſubſtantiation, and if *Marcion* had been ſo ſubtle to have uſed the Evaſions thoſe do in the Roman Church, he might have defended the putative body of Chriſt in the very ſame manner that they do the being of accidents without a ſubſtance.

l. 4 c. 4 " In the fourth Book he aſſerts againſt *Mar-* " *cion* the Authority of the Goſpel received c. 5. " in the Chriſtian Church above that which " *Marcion* allowed, by the greater Anti- " quity and the univerſal reception of the " true Goſpels; and after refutes the ſuppo- " ſition of a twofold Chriſt one for the Jews c. 7 &c. " and another for the Gentiles from the com- " paring of Scriptures together, which he " doth with great diligence and anſwers all " the arguments from thence brought by " *Marcion*, to prove that Chriſt was an " enemy to the Law of *Moſes*. In his fifth " and laſt Book he proves out of the Epiſtles " of St. *Paul*, allowed by *Marcion*, that he " preached no other God than the Creator, " and that Chriſt was the Son of God the " Creator; which he doth from the ſcope and circumſtances of the places without appre- hending the leaſt neceſſity of calling in any Infallible Guides to give the certain ſenſe and meaning of them.

Againſt

Againſt *Hermogenes*, he diſputes about the eternity of matter; the Controverſy between them he tells us was concerning the ſenſe of ſome places of Scripture, which relate to the Creation of things; *Tertullian* proves "that all things were made of nothing, becauſe it is not mentioned out of "what they were made; *Hermogenes* proves "they were made out of matter; becauſe it "is not ſaid they were made of nothing. To "determine therefore the ſenſe of theſe places "*Tertullian* ſhews from reaſon the repugnancy of the eternity of matter to the attributes of God: he compares ſeveral places "of Scripture together, he reaſons from the "manner of the expreſſions and the Idiom of "Scripture. I adore, ſaith he, the fulneſs "of the Scripture which ſhews me both the "maker and the thing made; but the Goſpel "likewiſe diſcovers by whom all things were "made. But the Scripture no where ſaith "that all things were made out of matter. "Let the ſhop of *Hermogenes* ſhew where "it is written; and if it be not written let "him fear the wo denounced to thoſe who "add or take from what is written. He examins the ſeveral places in diſpute, and by "proving that ſenſe which *Hermogenes* put "upon them to be repugnant to reaſon, (as "he ſhews to the end of that Book) he concludes

Tertull. adverſus Hermog. c. 19.

c. 20. 21.

c. 22.

"cludes his ſenſe of Scripture to be falſe and "erroneous.

Againſt *Praxeas*, he diſputes whether God the Father took our nature upon him, and the arguments on both ſides are drawn from the *Scriptures*; but *Tertullian* well obſerves, "that they inſiſted upon two or three places "of Scripture, and would make all the reſt "though far more, to yield to them. Where- "as the fewer places ought to be underſtood "according to the ſenſe of the greater num- "ber. But this ſaith he, is the property "of all Hereticks becauſe they can find but "few places for them, they defend the "ſmaller number againſt the greater: which "is againſt the nature of a rule, wherein the "firſt and the moſt, ought to overſway the "latter and the fewer. And therefore he ſets himſelf throughout that Book to produce the far greater number of places of *Scripture*, which do aſſert the diſtinction between the Father and the Son; and conſequently that it could not be the Father who ſuffered for us.

Tertull. adverſus Praxeam. c. 20.

Hitherto we find nothing ſaid of an infallible Guide to give the certain ſenſe of Scripture, when the faireſt occaſion was offered, by thoſe who diſputed the moſt concerning the ſenſe of Scripture in the Age wherein they lived *viz.* by *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*.

I

I now proceed to *Clemens* of *Alexandria* who in his learned *Collections*, propoſes that objection, againſt Chriſtianity, that there were many Hereſies among Chriſtians, and therefore men could believe nothing. To which he anſwers, "That there were Here-"ſies among the Jews and Philoſophers; "and that objection was not thought ſuffi-"cient againſt *Judaiſm* or Philoſophy, and "therefore ought not to be againſt Chriſtia-"nity. Beſides the coming of Hereſies was "foretold, and what ever is foretold muſt "come to paſs. The *Phyſitians* ſaith he differ "in their opinions, yet men do not neglect "to make uſe of them, when they are ſick. "Hereſies ſhould only make men more care-"ful what they chooſe. Men ought thereby "to endeavour the more to find out truth "from falſhood; as if two ſorts of fruit be "offered to a man real, and waxen; will a "man abſtain from both, becauſe one is "Counterfeit, or rather find out the true "from the apparent? When ſeveral ways "offer themſelves for a man to go in, he "ought not therefore to ſit down and not ſtir "a ſtep further; but he uſes the beſt means "to find out the true way and then walks in "it. So that they are juſtly condemned who "do not diſcern the true from the falſe; for "they who will, ſaith he, may find out the "truth. Clem. Alex. and. Strom. 7.

" truth. For either there is demonſtration " or not; all grant demonſtration, or evi- " dence, who do not deſtroy our ſenſes; If " there be demonſtration there muſt be " ſearch and enquiry made; and by the Scri- " ptures we may demonſtratively learn how " Hereſies fell of, and that the exacteſt " knowledge was to be found in the truth and " the ancient Church. Now the true " ſearchers will not leave till they find Evi- " dence from the Scriptures. To this end, " he commends the exerciſe of mens reaſon " and underſtanding, impartiality or laying " aſide opinion, a right diſpoſition of Soul, " for when men are given over to their luſts " they endeavour to wreſt the Scriptures to " them. But he eſtabliſhes the Scripture as " the only principle of certainty to Chriſtians, " and more credible than any demonſtration: " which who ſo have taſted are called faith- " ful, but thoſe who are verſed in them are " the truly knowing men. The great ob- jection now is, *that Hereticks make uſe of Scripture too:* I but they, ſaith he, reject what they pleaſe, and do " not follow the Body " and Contexture of Prophecy; but take " ambiguous expreſſions and apply them to " their own opinions: and a few ſcattered " phraſes without regarding the ſenſe and im- " portance of them. For in the Scriptures

" pro-

"produced by them, you may find them ei-
"ther making uſe of meer names, and chan-
"ging the ſignifications of them; never at-
"tending to the ſcope and intention of them.
"But truth, ſaith he, doth not lye in the
"change of the ſignification of words (for
"by that means all Truth may be over-
"thrown) but in conſidering what is proper
"and perfectly agreeable to our Lord and
"Almighty God, and in confirming every
"thing which is demonſtrated by the Scri-
"pture out of the ſame Scriptures. Where-
in *Clemens Alexandrinus* lays down ſuch rules as he thought neceſſary to find out the certain ſenſe of Scripture, *viz.* by conſidering the ſcope and coherence of the words, the proper ſenſe and importance of them, the comparing of Scripture with Scripture, and the Doctrine drawn from it with the nature and properties of God, all which are excellent Rules, without the leaſt intimation of the neceſſity of any Infallible Interpreter to give the certain ſenſe of doubtful places.

After this time a great diſpute aroſe in the Church about the rebaptizing *Hereticks*, managed by the *Eaſtern* and *African* Biſhops againſt *Stephen Biſhop* of *Rome*. Here the Queſtion was about the ſenſe of ſeveral places of Scripture, and the practice of the Apoſtles; as appears by the *Epiſtles* of *Cyprian* and

Cyprian. Epist. 74. and *Firmilian*; both parties pleading Scripture and Tradition for themselves. But no such thing as an infallibility in judgement was pleaded by the *Pope*, nor any thing like it in the least acknowledged by his Adversaries, *who charge* him, (without any respect to his Infallible guideship,) ***with pride***, ***error***, ***rashness***, ***impertinency***, ***and contradicting himself.*** Which makes *Baronius* very Tragically exclaim: and although he makes use of this as a great argument of the prevalency of Tradition, because the opinion of *Stephen* obtained in the Church; yet there is no Evidence at all that any Churches did submit to the opinion of *Stephen* when he declared himself, but as appears by *Dionysius* of *Alexandria's* Epistles, the Controversy continued after his time; and if we look into the judgement of the Church in following Ages, we shall find that neither *Stephens* opinion, nor his Adversaries were followed; (for *Stephen* was against rebaptizing any *Hereticks*, and the others were for rebaptizing all, because one Baptism was only in the true Church:) For in the 19. Canon of the Council of *Nice* the ***Samosatenian Baptism is pronounced null*** and the persons who received it are to be new Baptized; and the first Council of *Arles* decrees, that ***in case of Heresy men are to receive new Baptism but not otherwise:*** The second

Firmil. inter epas Cyprian 75.

Baron. Annal. ad A. D. 258. n. 36. n. 52.

Euseb. l. 7. c. 5.

Concil. Arelat. 1. c. 8.

second Council of *Arles* puts a distinction between Hereticks; decreeing *that the* Photinians *and* Samosatenians *should be Baptized again; but not the* Bonosiaci nor *the* Arians, *but they were to be received upon renouncing their Heresy without Baptism.* Which seems the harder to understand since the *Bonosiaci* were no other than *Photinians.* The most probable way of solving it is, that these two latter sorts did preserve the form of Baptism entire, but the *Photinians* and *Samosatenians* altered it: which St. *Augustin* saith, is a thing to be believed. So *Gennadius* reports it that those who were Baptized without invocation of the *B. Trinity*, were to he Baptized upon their reception into the Church (not rebaptized because the former was accounted null) of these he reckons not only the *Paulianists* and *Photinians*, but the *Bonosiaci* too and many others. But St. *Basil* determines the case of Baptism, not from the *form* but from the *faith* which they professed; a Schismatical Baptism he saith, was allowed, but not *Heretical*, by which he means such as denyed the Trinity; and therein he saith, S. *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* were to blame, because they would allow no Baptism among persons separated from the Communion of the Church. The *Council* of *Laodicea* decreed *that the* Novatians, Photinians, *and*

Concil. Arelat. 2. c. 16. 17.

Aug. de haeres. cap. 44.

Gennad. de Eccles dogmat. c. 52.

Basil Epist. Can. 1. ad Amephioch.

Concil Laodicen. c. 7 8.

Quarto-decimans *were to be received without new Baptiſm, but not the* Montaniſts, *or* Cataphryges: but *Binius* ſaith there was one Copy, wherein the *Photinians* were left out; and then theſe Canons may agree with the reſt; and *Baronius* aſſerts *that the greater number of* M. S. Copies leave out *Photinians*, And withal he proves, that the Church did never allow the Baptiſm of the *Photinians*, though it did of the *Arians*; by which we ſee that the Church afterwards did not follow that which *Stephen* pretended to be an Apoſtolical tradition, *viz. that no Hereticks ſhould be rebaptized*; and from hence we may conclude that the *Pope* was far from being thought an *infallible Guide* or *Interpreter of Scripture*, either by that, or ſucceeding Ages; when not only ſingle perſons that were eminent Guides of the Church (ſuch as the *African* and *Eaſtern* Biſhopswere,) oppoſed his Doctrine, and ſlighted his excommunications, but ſeveral *Councils* called both in the Eaſt and *Africa*, and the moſt eminent *Councils* of the *Church* afterwards (ſuch as the firſt of *Arles* and *Nice*) decreed contrary to what he declared to be an *Apoſtolical Tradition*.

Baron. Annal. Tom. 4. in Append.

In the ſame Age we meet with another great Controverſy about the *ſenſe* of *Scripture*, for *Paulus Samoſatenus* openly denyed the *Divinity of Chriſt* and aſſerted the Doctrine of

of it to be repugnant to *Scripture*, and the ancient Apoſtolical tradition. For this *Paulus* revived the hereſie of *Artemon*; whoſe followers, as appears by the fragment of an ancient Writer againſt them in *Euſebius*, (ſuppoſed to be *Caius*) pleaded that the Apoſtles were of their mind, and that their Doctrine continued in the Church till the time of *Victor*, and then it began to be corrupted. Which ſaith that Writer would ſeem probable, if the holy Scriptures did not firſt contradict them; and the Books of ſeveral Chriſtians before *Victors* time. So that we ſee the main of the Controverſie did depend upon the ſenſe of Scripture which was pleaded on both ſides. But what courſe was taken in this important Controverſie to find out the certain ſenſe of Scripture? Do they appeal to any infallible Guides? Nothing like it. But in the *Councils* of *Antioch*, in the Writings of *Dionyſius* of *Alexandria* and others ſince, they who oppoſed the *Samoſatenian* Doctrine endeavoured with all their ſtrength to prove that to be the true ſenſe of Scripture, which aſſerted the Divinity of Chriſt. It is great pity the diſpute of *Malchion* with *Paulus* is now loſt, which was extant in *Euſebius* his time; but in the Queſtions and Anſwers between *Paulus* and *Dionyſius*; (which *Valeſius* without reaſon ſuſpects

Epiphan. hæreſ. 65.

Euſebii Eccleſi. hiſtor. l. 5. c. 28.

Vaſſ. nota in Euſeb. l. 7 c. 30.

ſpects ſince St. *Hierome* mentions his Epiſtle againſt *Paulus*) the diſpute was about the true ſenſe of Scripture which both pleaded for themſelves. *Paulus* inſiſts on thoſe places, which ſpeak of the humane infirmities of Chriſt, which he ſaith prove that he was meer "Man and not God; the other anſwers "that theſe things were not inconſiſtent with "the Being of the Divine nature, ſince ex- "preſſions implying humane paſſions are attri- "buted to God in Scripture: But he proves "from multitude of Scriptures, and reaſons "drawn from them that the divine nature is "attributed to Chriſt, and therefore the other "places which ſeem repugnant to it, are to "be interpreted in a ſenſe agreeable thereto.

Epiphan. hæreſ. 64. Sect. 5. The ſame courſe is likewiſe taken by *Epiphanius* againſt this hereſie: who ſaith "the "Chriſtians way of anſwering difficulties "was not from their own reaſons, but from *Sect. 6.* "the ſcope and conſequence of Scripture: and "particularly adds that the Doctrine of the "Trinity was carefully delivered in the Scri- "ptures, becauſe God foreſaw the many "hereſies which would ariſe about it.

But never any Controverſie about the ſenſe of Scripture diſturbed the Church more, than that which the *Arians* raiſed; and if ever any had reaſon to think of ſome certain and infallible way of finding out the ſenſe of Scri-

pture

pture the Catholick Christians of that Age had. I shall therefore give an account of what way the best Writers of the Church in that time took to find out the sense of Scripture in the Controverted places. Of all the Writers against them *Athanasius* hath justly the greatest esteem, and *Petavius* saith that God inspired him with greater skill in this Controversie, than any others before him. The principle he goes upon in all his disputes against the *Arians*, is this, *that our true faith is built upon the Scriptures*, so in several places of his conference with the *Arian* and in the beginning of his Epistle to *Jovianus* and elsewhere. Therefore in the entrance of his *Disputations* against the *Arians*, he adviseth all that would secure themselves from the "impostures of Hereticks, to study the "Scriptures; becaus those who are versed "therein stand firm against all their assaults; "but they who look only at the words, without "understanding the meaning of them are "easily seduced by them. And this Counsel he gives, after the Council of *Nice*, had decreed the *Arian* Doctrine to be *Heresie*; and although "he saith, other ways may "be used to confute it, yet becaus the Holy "Scripture is more sufficient than all of "them, therefore those who would be bet-"ter instructed in these things, I would ad-

Athanas. Cont Arian. Orat. 1. p. 287.

" vise them to be conversant in the divine " Oracles. *But did not the* Arians *plead Scripture as well as they? how then could the Scripture end this Controversie, which did arise about the sense of Scripture?* This objection, which is now made so much of against the Scriptures, was never so much as thought of in those days; or if it were, was not thought worth answering; for they did not in the least desert the proofs of Scripture, because their Adversaries made use of it too. But they endeavoured to shew that their Adversaries Doctrine had no solid Foundation in Scripture, but theirs had *i. e.* that the *Arians* perverted it, because they did not examine and compare places as they ought to do, but run away with a few words, without considering the scope and design of them; or comparing them with places plainer than those were which they brought. Thus when the *Arians* objected that place *My Father is greater than I*, *Athanasius* bids them compare that with other places, such as *My Father and I are one*, and *who being in the form of God thought it no robbery to be equal with God*; and *by him all things were made*, &c. When *Arius* objected, *to us there is but one God of whom are all things*, he tells him, he ought to consider the following words, *and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom*

Atha. Cont. Aran. disput. p. 116. &c.

are

are all things; from whence when *Arius* argued *that Christ was only Gods instrument in creating things*, *Athanasius* then bids him compare this place with another, where it is said *of whom the whole body*, &c. Not barely διὰ but ἐξ. When the *Arians* objected, Christs saying, *all things are delivered to me from my Father*, *Athanasius* opposes that place of St. *John* to it, *By him all things were made*; Thus when they objected several other places, he constantly hath recourse to *John* 1. 1, 2, 3. to *Phil.* 2. 7. 1 *John* 5. 20. and others which he thought the plainest places for Christs eternal Divinity; and by these he proves that the other were to be interpreted, with a respect to his humane nature, and the State he was in upon Earth. So that the greatest Defender of the Doctrine of the Trinity against the *Arians* saw no necessity at all of calling in the Assistance of any infal ible Guides, to give the certain sense of Scripture in these doubtful places; but he thought the Scripture plain enough to all those who would impartially examine it; and for others who wilfully shut their eyes, no light could be great enough for them. Indeed, when the *Arians* called in the help of any of the Ancient Writers to justify their Doctrine, then *Athanasius* thought himself concerned to vindicate them; as particularly

Eph. 4 16.

Athan. de sent. Dionysii c. Arian. p. 549.

Dionyſius of *Alexandria*. But, as he ſaith, *if they can produce Scripture or Reaſon for what they ſay let them do it, but if not, let them hold their peace:* Thereby implying that theſe were the only conſiderable things to be regarded: yet he ſhews at large that they abuſed the Teſtimony of *Dionyſius*, who although in his letters againſt *Sabellius* he ſpake too much the other way, yet in other of his writings he ſufficiently cleared himſelf from being a favourer of the *Arian* Hereſie. And although *Athanaſius* doth elſe where ſay, *that the Faith which the Catholick Church then held was the faith of their Fore-fathers, and deſcended from the Apoſtles*; yet, he no where ſaith, that without the help of that Tradition it had been impoſſible to have known the certain ſenſe of Scripture, much leſs without the infallible interpretation of the Guides of the preſent Church.

Athan. Orat. 1. c. Arian. ad Adelph. c. Paul. Samoſat. ep. ad Serapi.

S. *Hilary* in his diſputes againſt the ſame Hereticks, profeſſes in the beginning "that his "intention was to confound their rage and ig-"norance out of writings of the Prophets and "Apoſtles: and to that end deſires of his Rea-"ders that they would conceive of God not "according to the Laws of their own beings, "but according to the greatneſs of what he had "declared of himſelf. For he is the beſt Rea-"der of Scripture, who doth not bring his ſenſe

Hilar. de Trinit. l. 1

"to

"to the Scripture, but takes it from it, and "doth not reſolve before hand to find that "there, which he concluded muſt be the ſence "before he reads. In things therefore which "concern God, we muſt allow him to know "himſelf beſt, and give due Reverence to "his word. For he is the beſt witneſs to him-"ſelf who cannot be known but by himſelf. In which words he plainly aſſerts that the Foundation of our Faith muſt be in the Scriptures, and that a free and impartial mind is neceſſary to find out the true ſenſe of Scripture. And after he had ſaid in the ſecond Book, that Hereſies ariſe from miſunderſtanding the Scripture, and charged in his fourth Book the *Arians* particularly with it, he proceeds to anſwer all the places produced by them out of the old and new Teſtament, by comparing ſeveral places together, and the antecedents and conſequents, and by theſe means proving that they miſtook the meaning of Scripture. So in the beginning of his ninth Book rehearſing the Common places, which were made uſe of by the *Arians*, he ſaith, "they repeated the words alone, with-"out enquiring into the meaning, or Con-"texture of them; whereas the true ſenſe of "Scripture is to be taken from the antece-"dents and conſequents: their fundamental "miſtake being the applying thoſe things to "his

Hilar. l. 9.

" his Divine nature, which were ſpoken of " his humane: which he makes good by a particular examination of the ſeveral places in Controverſie.

The ſame courſe is taken by *Epiphanius*, *Phœbadius* and others of the ancient Writers of the Church, who aſſerted the Eternal Divinity of Chriſt againſt the *Arians*. *Epiphanius* therefore charges them which mangling and perverting the ſenſe of Scripture; underſtanding figurative expreſſions literally, and thoſe which are intended in a plain ſenſe figuratively.

Epiph. hæreſ. 69. ſ. 50.

So that it is obſervable in that great Controverſie which diſturbed the Church ſo many years, which exerciſed the wits of all men in that time to find out a way to put an end to it, after the Guides of the Church had in the Council of *Nice* declared what was the Catholick faith: yet ſtill the Controverſie was managed about the ſenſe of Scripture, and no other ways made uſe of for finding it, than ſuch as we plead for at this day. It is a moſt incredible thing, that in a time of ſo violent contention, ſo horrible confuſion, ſo ſcandalous diviſions in the Chriſtian Church, none of the Catholick Biſhops ſhould once ſuggeſt this admirable Expedient of Infallibility. But this *Palladium* was not then fallen down from heaven, or if it were,

it

it was kept ſo ſecret, that not one of the Writers of the Chriſtian Church in that buſie and diſputing Age diſcovered the leaſt knowledge of it. Unleſs it be ſaid that of all times it was then leaſt fit to talk of *Infallibility* in the *Guides* of the *Church*, when they ſo frequently in Councils contradicted each other. The *Synodical Book* in the new Tomes of the Councils, reckons up 31. ſeveral Councils of Biſhops in the time of the *Arian* Controverſie, whereof near 20. were for the *Arians*, and the reſt againſt them. *If the ſenſe of Scripture were in this time to be taken from the Guides of the Church*, what ſecurity could any man have againſt *Arianiſm?* ſince the Councils which favoured it, were more numerous than thoſe which oppoſed and condemned it. Yea ſo mean was the opinion which ſome of the greateſt perſons of the Church at that time had of the *Guides* of the *Church* met together in *Councils*, that St. *Gregory Nazianzen* declares *he had not ſeen a good iſſue of any one of them; but they rather increaſed miſchief than removed any; becauſe of the contention and ambition which ruled in them, therefore he reſolved to come no more at any of them.* What? had St. *Gregory* ſo mean an eſteem of the *Guides of the Chriſtian Church* to think that, *ambition and contention* ſhould ſway them in their Councils

Concil. General. Tom. 2. p. 84.

Greg. Nazian. Ep. 55.

Councils and not the ſpirit of God, which certainly rules not where the other do? Yet this he declares to be his mind upon conſideration and experience in that time, and if he had lived to thoſe bleſſed days of the Councils of latter Ages, with what zeal and Rhetorick would he have ſet them forth? Never was any anſwer more jejune to this Teſtimony than that of *Bellarmin*, *viz.* that forſooth *there could be no lawful Councils called in his time*; and why ſo I pray? was there not a good Authority to call them? But if that had been the reaſon, he did not ſo little underſtand the way of expreſſing himſelf, to aſſign the cauſe of it to *contention and ambition*, if he mean quite another thing which he doth not in the leaſt intimate. And *what if he were afterwards preſent at the Council of* Conſtantinople? doth that ſhew, that his mind was in the leaſt changed? but in this Epiſtle he declares, how little good was to be exſpected from a Council, and yet afterwards by the Emperours command he might be preſent at one. St. *Auguſtin* in dealing with *Maximinus* the *Arian* expreſly ſets aſide *all Authority of the* Guides *of the Church, as to the ſenſe of Scripture in the places controverted between them*; for he ſaith, *I will neither bring the Authority of the Council of* Nice, *neither ſhall you that of* Ariminum; *but*

Bellar. de Concil. Author. l. 2. c. 7.

Auguſt. C. Maxim. l. 3. c. 14.

but we will proceed by Authorities of Scripture that are common to both of us, and by the cleareſt Evidence of reaſon. It ſeems then St. *Auguſtin* was far from thinking that there could be no certainty of the ſenſe of Scripture if the Authority of the *Guides* of the *Church* be ſet aſide. But by what means doth he then think, that men may come to any certainty about the true meaning of Scripture? of that he is beſt able to give us an account himſelf having written purpoſely in this ſubject in his Books of Chriſtian Doctrine the ſubſtance of what he there ſays may be comprehended in theſe Rules.

1. "That the main ſcope of the Scripture "is to perſwade men to the Love of God "and our Neighbour, without which, he "faith, no man doth truly underſtand it; "but whoſoever interprets Scripture to the "advancing of that, though he may be "miſtaken as to the ſenſe of the words, yet "his errour is not dangerous. *Aug. de Doctri. Chriſtia. l. 1. c. 35. 36.*

2. "That in order to the right under-"ſtanding of Scripture men muſt apply them-"ſelves to it with minds duly prepared for "it; by a fear of God, humility, prayer, "ſincerity, and purity of heart. *l. 2. c. 7.*

3. "That all thoſe things which are ne-"ceſſary to Salvation are plainly laid down "in Holy Scriptures; This is in terms aſſert-

"ed

L 2. c 9. "ed by him, as a fundamental principle, "that in thoſe things which are plainly ſet "down in Scripture, all things are to be "found which contain our faith and rule of "life. *i.e.* All things which are neceſſary "to the Love of God and our Neighbour, and "conſequently to the making us happy. And "theſe things men ought eſpecially to read "the Scriptures for; and the more they find "of them, the larger their underſtanding of "Scripture is.

4. "That the obſcure places of Scripture "are to be underſtood by the plain. For "which end he requires frequent reading, "and uſing ones ſelf to the language of Scri-
Ib. "ptures, and drawing examples from plain "places to illuſtrate difficult, and thoſe
L. 3. c. 26. "which are certain to clear the doubtful. "For, ſcarce any thing, ſaith he, is drawn
L. 2. c. 6. "out of the moſt difficult places, but what is "very plainly ſet down elſewhere.

5. "That in regard of the infinite variety "of Latin Interpreters (which it ſeems were in "his time) in matters of doubt it was ne-"ceſſary to have recourſe to the Original
L 2. c. 10. "Hebrew and Greek: the knowledge of "which tongues might therefore be neceſſary "to the knowledge of Scripture, becauſe "ſeveral words are preſerved untranſlated; "but thoſe being few the neceſſity is not ſo

"great

" great on their account, as the diverſity of
" Interpreters; for although thoſe who had c. 11.
" tranſlated the Hebrew into Greek might be
" reckoned up, the Latin Interpreters could not.
" Which diverſity of tranſlations doth rather
" help than hinder the underſtanding of Scri-
" pture, if the Readers of it be not negligent;
" for ſome doubtful places are cleared by the
" difference of readings.

6. " Where the ambiguity lyes in proper
" words, the clearing of it depends on the cir-
" cumſtances of the place; in ſo much that l. 3. c. 4.
" he determines, that it is a very rare and
" difficult thing to find ſuch an ambiguity in
" the words of Scripture, which may not be
" cleared from the intention of the Writer, or
" comparing places, or ſearching the Origi-
" nal Language.

7. " Men muſt carefully diſtinguiſh be-
" tween proper and figurative expreſſions; for
" to underſtand figurative expreſſions lite- l. 3. c. 5.
" rally is to ſubject our underſtanding to car-
" nal conceptions of things; and that is,
" ſaith he, a miſerable ſlavery of mind, to
" take ſigns for things; ſuch ſigns he tells us
" under the Goſpel are the two Sacraments
" of Baptiſm and the Lords ſupper. The c. 9.
" great difficulty herein, lyes in the finding
" out the difference between proper and figu-
" rative expreſſions, for which he lays down
" this

"this rule, if the words of Scripture com-
"mand what is good and forbid what is evil,
c. 15, 16. "it is no figurative expreſſion; but if it for-
"bids what is good, or command any thing
"that is evil, it muſt be figuratively under-
"ſtood. For which he inſtances in thoſe
"words of our Saviour *unleſs ye eat the fleſh,*
"*and drink the blood of the Son of man*
"*ye ſhall have no life in you.* Which ſeeming
"to command ſomething evil, muſt be figu-
"ratively underſtood of Communicating in
"the Paſſion of Chriſt, and calling to mind
"that his fleſh was crucified and wounded for
"us.

8. "There is no danger in different ſenſes
"being given of the ſame place of Scripture,
"if every one of thoſe ſenſes appear by other
L. 3. c. 26. "places to be agreeable to Truth: This being
"ſuppoſed that the perſon do ſincerely en-
"quire after the ſenſe of the Author; For,
"ſaith he, that Divine Spirit might eaſily
"foreſee how many ſeveral ſenſes thoſe words
"are capable of, which being agreeable to
"other parts of Scripture, though not the
"particular meaning of thoſe words, the
"miſtake cannot be dangerous therein.

9. "Where ſuch a ſenſe is given which can-
"not be proved by other certain Teſtimonies
"of Scripture, it muſt be made manifeſt to be
L. 3 c. 28. "the ſenſe by clear Evidence of Reaſon. But

"he

" he rather approves the way of proving the " ſenſe of Scripture by other places of Scri- " pture, where the interpretation is doubtful. " So that the way in doubtful places which " he preſcribes is this, either to draw ſuch a " ſenſe from them as hath no diſpute con- " cerning its being a true Propoſition, or if " it have, that it be confirmed by other places " of Scripture.

Beſides theſe, he lays down the 7. rules of *Ticonius* the *Donatiſt* which are not of that conſequence to be here repeated; that which I take notice of is, that St. *Auguſtin* thought the rules he gave ſufficient for underſtanding the meaning of Scripture in doubtful places; but he doth not in the leaſt mention the *Infallibility* of the *Guides of the Church* as a neceſſary means for that end. But he doth aſſert in as plain terms, as I have done, *that Scripture is plain in all neceſſaries to Salvation to any ſober enquirer*, and what ever conſequences are charged upon me for making that a Fundamental principle, muſt reflect as much upon St. *Auguſtin* as me; and I do not fear all the objections can be made againſt a principle ſo evident to reaſon, and ſo agreeable not only to St. *Auguſtin*, but the Doctrine of the Catholick Church both before and after him.

The next after St. *Auguſtin* who hath pur-

posely writ of this argument about the sense of Scripture is *Vincentius Lerinensis*: about 4. years after St. *Augustins* death and 3. after the Council of *Ephesus*, who seems to attribute more to the *Guides of the Church* than St. *Augustin* doth, yet far enough short of *Infallibility*. He saith, "that every man "ought to strengthen his faith against Heresie "by two things, first by the Authority of "the divine Law, and then by the Tradi-"tion of the Catholick Church: which tra-"dition he makes necessary, not by way of "addition to the Scripture, for he allows "the perfection and sufficiency of that for "all things; but only to interpret Scripture "by giving a certain sense of it, there being "such different opinions among men about "it. For all the Hereticks whom he there "names had different senses of Scripture, as "*Novatianus*, *Sabellius*, *Donatus*, *Arius*, *Mace-*"*donius*, *Photinus*, &c. But then he bounds "this tradition within the compass of the uni-"versal consent of Antiquity as well as the "present Church; or as he expresseth it, "within those things which were believed "*every where*, *always*, and *by all persons*. That we may therefore consider how far these rules of *Vincentius* will serve for explaining the sense of Scripture, we are to take notice of the restrictions he lays upon them

Vincent. Lerin. Commonitor. p. 4.

1. That

1. That they are to be taken together, and not one of them ſeparate from the reſt. As for inſtance, that of *Univerſality* in any one Age of the Church, being taken without the *conſent* of *Antiquity*, is no ſufficient rule, to interpret *Scripture* by. For *Vincentius* doth ſuppoſe that any one Age of the Church may be ſo overrun with Hereſie, that there is no way to confute it, but by recourſe to Antiquity. "For in the caſe of the *Arian* he-"reſie, he grants that almoſt the whole "Church was overſpread with it, and there "was then no way left but to prefer the con-"ſent of Antiquity before a prevailing no-"velty. In ſome caſes the Univerſal conſent of the preſent Church is to be relyed upon againſt the attempts of particular perſons, as in that of the *Donatiſts*; but then we are to conſider, that *Antiquity* was ſtill pleaded on the ſame ſide that *Univerſality* was, and ſuppoſing that all the Ancient Church from the Apoſtles times had been of the ſame mind with the *Donatiſts*, the greater number of the ſame Age oppoſing them, would have been no more cogent againſt them, than it was afterwards for the *Arians*. It is unreaſonable to believe that in a thing univerſally believed by all Chriſtians from the Apoſtles times the Chriſtian Church ſhould be deceived; but it is quite another thing to ſay,

that the Church in any one or more Ages since the Apostles times may be deceived; especially if the Church be confined to one certain Communion excluding all others, and the persons in that Church have not liberty to deliver their opinions, for then it is impossible to know what the Judgement of the whole Church is. And so *universality* is not thought by *Vincentius* himself to be alone sufficient to determine the sense of Scripture; supposing that *universality* to be understood according to the honesty of the Primitive times *for a free and general consent* of the Christians of that Age in which a man lives; but since the great divisions of the Christian world, it is both a very hard matter to know the consent of Christendom in most of the Controverted places of Scripture, and withal the notion of *Universality* is debauched and corrupted, and made only to signifie the consent of one great Faction, which is called by the name of the *Catholick Church*, but truly known by the name of *Roman*.

2. That great care and Judgement must be used in the applying those Rules; for

1. The consent of Antiquity is not equally evident in all matters in dispute; and therefore cannot be of equal use.

1. There are some things wherein we may be certain of such a consent, and that was in the

Rule

Rule of Faith, as *Vincentius* and moſt of the ancient Writers call it *i. e.* the ſummary comprehenſion of a Chriſtians duty as to matters of faith, which was not ſo often called the *Symbol* as the *Rule* of *Faith*, that I mean which was delivered to perſons, who were to be baptized and received into the Church, this the ancient Church Univerſally agreed in as to the ſubſtance of it. And as to this *Vincentius* tells us his Rule is eſpecially to be underſtood. "For ſaith he, this conſent of Antiquity is not to be ſought for in all queſtions that may ariſe about the ſenſe of Scripture, but only or at leaſt chiefly in the Rule of Faith: or as he elſewhere explains himſelf, alone or chiefly in thoſe Queſtions which concern the Fundamentals of the Catholick Doctrine: which were thoſe contained in the Rule of Faith, delivered to all that were to be baptized. Suppoſe men now ſhould ſtretch this Rule beyond the limits aſſigned it by *Vincentius*, what ſecurity can there be from him that it ſhall be a certain rule, who confined it within ſuch narrow bounds? Not that I think, his Rules of no uſe at all now; no, I think them to be of admirable uſe and great importance to Chriſtianity, if truly underſtood and applyed. *i. e.* When any Perſons take upon them to impoſe any thing upon others as a neceſſary

Commonit. 1. c. 39.

Commonit. 2. c. Antepenult.

matter of faith to be believed by them, we can have no better rules of Judgement in this case than those of *Vincentius* are, *viz. Antiquity*, *Universality* and *Consent*; and whatsoever cannot be proved by these Rules ought to be rejected by all Christians. To make this plain, the Ancient *Creeds* we allow on both sides to have been universally received by the Catholick Church; but now the *Church* of *Rome* addsnew Articles to be believed, we desire to put the whole matter upon this issue: Let the Popes Supremacy, the Roman Churches Infallibility, the Doctrines of Transubstantiation, Purgatory, &c. be proved by as Universal Consent of Antiquity as the Articles of the Creed are, and then let them charge us with *Heresie* if we reject them. But we say the measure of Heresie in the Ancient Church was the rejecting the *Rule* of *Faith* universally received among Christians, this *Rule* of *Faith*, we stand to, and say no other can be made upon any pretence whatsoever, as *Vincentius* at large proves; but what ever things are obtruded on the belief of Christians, which want that *Universal consent* of *Antiquity*, which the *Rule* of *Faith* had, we are bound by *Vincentius*, from plain Scripture, *to shun them as prophane novelties and corruptions of the Christian Faith.* These Rules therefore are not

Vincent. Commonit. 1. a. 26. ad 35.

not barely allowed, but pleaded for by us, in the teſt of Articles of Faith, as to which *Vincentius* tells us, if not the *only*, yet the *chief* uſe of them is.

2. But ſuppoſe the Queſtion be not, concerning the expreſs Articles of this Rule of Faith, but concerning the ſenſe and meaning of them, how then are we to find out the conſent of *Antiquity*? For they might all agree in the words and yet have a different notion of the things. As *Petavius* at large proves, that there was an ancient Tradition for the ſubſtance of the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*, and yet he confeſſes that moſt of the Writers of the ancient Church did differ in their explication of it from that, which was only allowed by the Council of *Nice*: And he grants, that *Arius* did follow the opinion of many of the Ancients in the main of his Doctrine, who were guilty of the ſame error that he was before the matter was throughly diſcuſſed. Here now ariſes the greateſt difficulty to me in this point of *Tradition*; the uſefulneſs of it, I am told, is for explaining the *ſenſe* of *Scripture*: but there begins a great Controverſie in the *Church* about the explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, I deſire to know whether *Vincentius* his Rules will help us here? It is pleaded by St. *Hierome* and others, "that the Writers of the Church

Petav. Dogm. Theol. Tom. 2. in præfat.

L. 1. c. 8. ſect. 2.

Hier. Ad. l. c. Ruffin.

"might err in this matter, or ſpeak un-
"warily in it before the matter came to be
"throughly diſcuſſed; if ſo, how comes the Teſtimony of *erroneous* or *unwary Writers* to be the *certain means* of giving the *ſenſe* of *Scripture?* And in moſt of the Controverſies of the Church this way hath been uſed to take off the Teſtimony of perſons, who writ before the Controverſie began, and ſpake differently of the matter in debate. I do not deny the truth of the allegation in behalf of thoſe perſons; but to my underſtanding it plainly ſhews the incompetency of *Tradition* for giving a certain ſenſe of Scripture, when that Tradition is to be taken from the Writers of the foregoing Ages: and if this had been the only way of confuting *Arius*, it is a great Queſtion how he could ever have been condemned, if *Petavius* or St. *Hierome* ſay true? But ſince a General Council hath determined the contrary to the opinion of theſe Writers before, which Council hath been received by the Univerſal Church, I will not deny that they had better opportunities of knowing what the ſenſe of the Ancient Church was, when ſo many writings were extant which are now loſt, than we can have at this diſtance; and therefore we yield all ſubmiſſion to a *Council* of that nature and proceeding in that manner which

which that of *Nice* did; who did not meerly determine that Controverſie by the number of Writers on their ſide before them, but by comparing the opinions afterwards with the *Rule* of *Scriptures*; and in this regard we acknowledge a great Reverence due to the decrees of ſuch General Councils as that was. Therefore next to the Rule of Faith we allow a great veneration to the determinations of lawful General Councils Univerſally received; which *Vincentius* himſelf pleads for: But ſuppoſing no general Councils or ſuch which are not allowed, or received for ſuch; we are yet to enquire into the ways of finding out Catholick tradition, which may interpret Scripture. For this end he propoſes another means which is, *The gathering together the opinions of thoſe Fathers alone; who living holily, wiſely and conſtantly in the faith and communion of the Catholick Church have died in that faith, or elſe for it.* But ſtill with this reſerve, *that what either all or many of them manifeſtly, frequently and conſtantly, as it were by a Council of them, have confirmed by their receiving, holding, and delivering of it, that ought to be held for undoubted, certain and firm; but whatſoever any one though holy and learned, though a Biſhop, confeſſour or Martyr, hath held againſt the opinion of others that ought not to be* C. 39.

looked

looked on as the judgement of the Church, but as his own private opinion, and therefore not to be followed. Which words I ſhall not examine with all the ſeverity that ſome have done, for then the proving theſe conditions to have been obſerved by any one perſon would require more pains, and be leſs capable of reſolution than the matter it ſelf is; but I ſay, that in moſt of the Controverſies this day in the Chriſtian world, it may be much more ſatisfactory to examine the merits of the cauſe than the integrity of the witneſſes, theſe conditions being ſuppoſed. And yet after all this, we muſt not miſunderſtand him, as though this way would ſerve to confute all hereſies; For he tells us yet farther.

2. "This courſe can only hold in ſome
c. 37. "new and upſtart hereſies *i. e.* in caſe of the "pretence of ſome new revelation when men "pretend to ſome ſpecial grace without hu- "mane induſtry to diſcover ſome divine "truth, not known before; but in caſe of an-
c. 39. "cient and inveterate hereſies; he ſaith we "have no way to deal with them, but either "only by Scripture, or elſe by plain decrees "of General Councils, for when hereſies "have been of long continuance, then, ſaith "he, we may have ground to ſuſpect they "have not dealt fairly with the Teſtimonies

"of

"of ancient times. And thus we ſee what *Vincentius* hath offered towards the reſolution of this great Queſtion, *how we may be ſure of the certain ſenſe of Scripture in controverted places*; wherein is nothing contained but what we are willing to ſtand to; and very far from the leaſt ſuppoſition of any infallibility in the preſent Guides of the Church for that end.

Thus far I have taken the pains to ſearch into the opinion of the Primitive Church in this important Controverſie; which I might carry yet farther, if it were at all needful. The ſubſtance of what is delivered by them is this, that if any Controverſie ariſe in the Church concerning the ſenſe of Scripture, if the Perſons do not allow the Scripture, then we are to proceed by the beſt means we can have without it, *viz.* The tradition of Apoſtolical Churches from the beginning; if they do allow the Scripture then we are to examine and compare places of Scripture with all the care and judgement that may be. If after all this, the diſpute ſtill continues, then if it be againſt the ancient Rule of Faith univerſally received, that is a ſufficient preſcription againſt any opinion; if not againſt the Rule of Faith in expreſs words, but about the ſenſe of it, then if ancient General Councils have determined it which had greater oppor-

opportunities of knowing the ſenſe of the Apoſtolical Church than we, it is reaſonable we ſhould yield to them; but if there have been none ſuch, then the unanimous conſent of Fathers is to be taken, ſo it be in ſome late and upſtart hereſies, which men pretend to have by Revelation or ſome ſpecial Grace of God. Now either all theſe means were ſufficient or not to find out the ſenſe of Scripture, if not, then the ancient Church was wholly defective and wanted any certain way of finding out the ſenſe of Scripture; if theſe were ſufficient, then there is no neceſſity of infallibility in the Guides of the Church to give us a certain ſenſe of Scripture: which was the thing to be proved.

§. 14. *S. Auguſtins Teſtimony examined. p. 85.*

But *N. O.* towards the concluſion of his Book produces St. *Auguſtin* for the Churches Infallibility, in delivering the ſenſe of Scripture in obſcure places; which being contrary to what I have already ſaid concerning him, muſt be examined before I conclude this diſcourſe about the ſenſe of Scripture.

Aug. c. Creſcon. l. 1. c. 33.

The place is out of his Anſwer to Creſconius *concerning the obſcure point of Rebaptization; in theſe words, ſince the holy Scripture cannot deceive, let whoſoever is in fear of being deceived by the obſcurity of this Queſtion, conſult the ſame Church about it, which*

which Church the holy Scripture doth without all ambiguity demonſtrate. And before, the truth of the Holy Scriptures is held by us in this matter, when we do that which hath pleaſed the Univerſal Church, which the Authority of the Scripture does commend, &c. *All which is falſe and ſaid to no purpoſe* ſaith N. O. *if the Scripture be not clear in this, that this Church can determine nothing in ſuch important conteſts contrary to the verity of the Scriptures, and that we ought to give credit to what ſhe decides; for then it would not be true, what he ſays the truth of the ſame Scripture in this matter is held by us: and he who is in fear of being deceived by the obſcurity of this Queſtion, is no way relieved in following the ſentence of the Church.* To which I anſwer,

That St. *Auguſtin* doth not ſuppoſe, that men cannot attain to any certainty of the the ſenſe of Scripture in this matter without the Churches Infallibility; for, he ſaith, in the Chapter preceding, *that in this matter we follow the moſt certain Authority of Canonical Scriptures*; but he puts the caſe *that no certain example could be produced out of Scripture*, then he ſaith, *they had the truth of the Scriptures when they do that which pleaſed the Univerſal Church*, &c. For the explaining St. *Auguſtins* meaning,

we

we are to consider, that there were two Controversies then on foot in the Church with the *Donatists*, the one concerning *Rebaptization*, the other concerning the *Church*: the former he looks upon as more intricate and obscure, by reason not only of the doubtfulness of Scripture, but the Authority of about seventy Bishops of *Africa*, who had determined for it, among whom St. *Cyprian* was chief, which we see in all his disputes with the *Donatists* on this subject he is very much perplexed with; therefore St. *Austin* finding that Controversie very troublesome, was willing to bring it to that issue, that what the Catholick Church after so much discussing the point had agreed upon should be received as the truth. By this means the dispute would be brought to that other Question, which he thought much more easie, *viz.* Which was the true Church, the Catholick or the *Donatists*: but by no means doth St. *Austin* hereby intend to make the Churches Authority to resolve all doubts concerning *Scriptures*; but he thought it much easier to prove by Scripture which was the true Church, than whether rebaptization were lawful or not. And accordingly his very next words are, *but if you doubt whether the Universal Church be that which the Scripture commends, I will lead*

you

you with many and moſt manifeſt Teſtimonies of Scripture to that end. Which is the deſign of his Book of the *Unity of the Church:* wherein he ſhews, "That thoſe Teſtimonies "of Scripture which ſpeak of the Univerſality of the Church, are very plain and "clear: and needed no interpretation at all, "that in this caſe we are not to regard what "*Donatus*, or *Parmenianus*, or *Pontius* hath "ſaid; for neither, ſaith he, are we to yield "to Catholick Biſhops themſelves, if they "be at any time ſo much deceived as to hold "what is contrary to Canonical Scriptures. By which it is evident that he ſuppoſed no infallibility in the *Guides* of the *Church.* And in terms he aſſerts, "that the Church "is to be proved by nothing but plain Scri-"ptures, neither by the Authority of *Op-"tatus*, or St. *Ambroſe*, or innumerable "Biſhops, nor Councils, nor Miracles, nor viſions and Revelations, (whatever *N. O.* thinks of them) now St. *Auguſtin* ſuppoſing there was much leſs ambiguity in Scripture in the Controverſie of the *Church* than in that of Rebaptization, he endeavours to bring them to a reſolution in the other point for the clearing of this: and ſo he only purſues the method laid down in the *Books of Chriſtian Doctrine*, to make uſe of plainer places of *Scripture* to give light to the darker.

Aug. de unit. Eccleſ. c. 4. 5, 19.

c. 10.

c. 16.

And

And when they were convinced by Scripture that the Catholick Church was the true Church of Christ, he doth not question but they would follow that which was the sentence of the Catholick Church. But here lyes the main difficulty, *on what account the sentence of the Church was to be followed?* In order to the resolution of it, we must take notice of these things.

1. That all the proofs which St. *Augustin* brings for the *Church* do relate only to the *extent* and *Universality* of it, and not to any *Infallibility* that is promised to it; as will easily appear to any one that will read his discourses on that subject against the *Donatists*.

2. That he asserts no infallibility in the highest Authority of the Church; which in many places of his *Books* of *Baptism* against the *Donatists* he makes to be a *Plenary* or *General Council*; *whose Authority*, he saith, *was to be preferred before that of St.* Cyprian, *or any particular Councils either in his time, or before it*; which he calls the *Authority and decrees of the Universal Church*. So that we see he resolves all the Authority of the Church in this matter into that of a *General Council:* (whether that of *Arles*, or *Nice* is not to my purpose to enquire) and we shall then see what his opinion is of the Churches infallibility by that which he de-

Aug. de Baptis. c. Donat. l. 2. c. 1. c. 9. l. 4. c. 6. l. 2. c. 4. l. 3. c. 10. l. 6. c. 2.

livers

livers of *General Councils*; as well as any other Church Authority compared with the Scriptures, in these remarkable words. *Who knows not that the sacred Canonical Scripture is contained within its certain bounds, and is so far to be preferred before all latter writings of Bishops that there can be no doubt or dispute at all made, whether that be true or right which is contained therein; but all latter writings of Bishops which have been or are written, since the Canon of Scripture hath been confirmed, may be corrected if in any thing they err from the Truth, either by the wiser discourse of any more skilful person, or the weightier Authority of other Bishops, or the prudence of more learned men, or by Councils: And even Councils themselves that are Provincial yield without dispute to those which are General, and called out of all the Christian World; and of these General Councils the former are often amended by the latter, when by some farther tryal of things that which was shut is laid open, and that which was hidden is made known without any swelling of sacrilegious pride, or stiffness of arrogancy, or contention of envy; but with holy humility, Catholick peace and Christian Charity.* Can any one that reads this excellent Testimony of St. *Augustin* delivered in this same mat-

De Bapt. c. Donat. l. 2. c. 3.

ter, ever imagine he could so plainly contradict himself; as to assert the Churches infallibility in one place and destroy it in another? Would he assert *that all Councils how General soever may be amended by following Councils*, and yet bind men to believe that the decrees of the former Councils do contain the unalterable will of God? A lesser person than St. *Augustin* would never thus directly contradict himself, and that about the very same Controversie, which words of his cannot be understood of *unlawful Councils*, of *matters of fact or practice*, but do refer to the great Question then in debate about rebaptizing Hereticks; and hereby he takes off the great Plea, the Donatists made from the Authority of St. *Cyprian* and his Council, which they continually urged for themselves.

3. He grants, that *the arguments drawn from the Churches Authority are but humane*, and that satisfaction is to be taken from the Scriptures in this Controversie. "For men-
De Bapt. l. 3. c. 4. "tioning the obscurity of this Question, and "the great debates that had been about it "before the *Donatists* time among great and "good men, and diverse resolutions of "Councils and the settlement of it at last by "a plenary Council of the whole World; "but lest, saith he, I should seem to make

"use

"use only of humane arguments, I produce "certain Testimonies out of the Gospel, by "which, God willing, I demonstrate how true "and agreeable to his Will the Doctrine and "practice of the Catholick Church is. And "else where he appeals not to the Judgement "of men, but to the Lords ballance, *viz.* To his Judgement delivered in Scripture, and in this same case when he was urged by the Authority of *Cyprian*, he saith, "There are "no Writings they have not liberty to judge "of, but those of Scripture, and by them "they are to Judge of all others, and what "is agreeable to them they receive, what is "not they reject, though written by per-"sons of never so great Authority. And af-ter all this is it possible to believe that St. *Augustin* should make the Churches decree in a General Council infallible? No: the ut-most by a careful consideration of his mind in this matter that I can find, is; that in a Question of so doubtful and obscure a nature as that was, which had been so long bandied in the Churches of *Africa*, and from thence spread over all the Churches of the Christian World, it was a reasonable thing to presume that what the whole Christian World did consent in was the truth, not upon the ac-count of infallibility, but the reasonable sup-position that all the Churches of the Chri-

De Baptis. l. 2. c. 14.

c. Crescon. l. 2. c. 31. 32.

ſtian World, would not conſent in a thing repugnant to any Apoſtolical Doctrine or Tradition. And ſo St. *Auguſtins* meaning is the ſame with *Vincentius Lerinenſis* as to the Univerſal atteſtation of the Chriſtian Church in a matter of Tradition; being declared by the decree of a General Council, and that decree Univerſally received but only by the litigant parties in *Africa*. To which purpoſe it is obſervable that he ſo often appeals to the *Univerſal conſent of Chriſtians* in this matter; *after it had been ſo throughly diſcuſſed and conſidered, by the moſt wiſe and diſintereſſed perſons, and that conſent declared by a Plenary Council before himſelf was born.* So that if Authority were to be relyed upon in this obſcure Controverſie, he ſaith, the Authority of the Univerſal Church was to be preferred, before that of ſeveral Councils in *Africa*, of the Biſhops and particularly St. *Cyprian* who met in them. And whereas St. *Cyprian* had ſlighted Tradition in this matter, *Chriſt having called himſelf Truth and not cuſtom*, St. *Auguſtin* replys to him; "That the cuſtom of the Church "having been always ſo and continuing after "ſuch oppoſition and confirmed by a General "Council, and after examination of the rea-"ſons and Teſtimonies of Scripture on both "ſides, it may be now ſaid, that we follow "what

C. Criſcon.
Ib. de Bapt.
C. Donat.
L. 1. c. 18.
L. 2. c. 9.
L. 3. c. 10.
L. 4. c. 6, 7
L. 5 c. 4
L. 6. c. 2.
L. 4. c. 7.

"what Truth hath declared. Wherein we ſee with what modeſty and upon what grounds he declares his mind, which at laſt comes to no more than *Vincentius* his *Rules* of *Antiquity*, *Univerſality* and *Conſent*. Eſpecially in ſuch a matter as this was, which had nothing but Tradition to be pleaded for it, *the Apoſtles, having determined nothing of either ſide, in their Books as St Auguſtin* himſelf at laſt confeſſes in this matter. The moſt then that can be made of the Teſtimony alledged out of St. *Auguſtin* is this, that in a matter of ſo doubtful and obſcure a nature wherein the Apoſtles have determined nothing in their Writings, we are to believe that to be the truth, which the Univerſal Church of Chriſt agreed in thoſe times, when the conſent of the Univerſal Church was ſo well known by frequent diſcuſſion of the caſe and coming at laſt to a reſolution in a General Council. In ſuch a caſe as this, I agree to what St. *Auguſtin* ſaith, and think a man very much relieved by following ſo evident a conſent of the Univerſal Church: not by vertue of any *infallibility*, but the unreaſonableneſs of believing ſo many, ſo wiſe, ſo diſintereſſed perſons ſhould be deceived. Let the ſame evidences be produced for the conſent of the *Univerſal Church* from the *Apoſtolical times* in the matters in diſpute be-

De Bapt. c. Donat. l. 5. c. 23.

tween our *Church* and that of *Rome*, and the Controverſie of *Infallibility* may be laid aſide; For ſuch an univerſal conſent of the Chriſtian Church I look upon as the moſt Authentick Interpreter of Holy Scripture in doubtful and obſcure places. But let them never think to fob us off, with the conſent of the *Roman Faction* for the *Univerſal Church*, nor of ſome *latter ages*, for a *Tradition from Apoſtolical times*, nor of a *packed Company of Biſhops* for a *truly General Council.* And thus much may now ſerve to clear that important Controverſie about the ſenſe of Scripture in doubtful places.

§. 15. Of Church Authority.

The laſt thing to be conſidered is, whether the ſame arguments which overthrow infallibility, do likewiſe deſtroy all Church-Authority? For this is by *N. O.* frequently objected againſt me; for, he ſaith, *thus it happens more than once in theſe Principles laid down by me, that in too forward a zeal in demoliſhing the one*, viz. *Church Infallibility, the other is alſo dangerouſly undermined*, viz. *Church-Authority.* And therefore out of his ſingular regard to the good of our Church, he ſaith, *it concerns my Superiors to look to it, whether their Churches and their own Authority ſuffers no detriment from my Principles*, and, again, he ſaith, *my Principles againſt Infallibility conclude, the*

P. 50.

uſe-

uſeleſſneſs of any Eccleſiaſtical Authority to teach men, as of an Infallible to aſſure men of the truth of thoſe things, which by uſing only their own ſincere endeavour they may know without them. And laſtly, he ſaith, *my Principles afford no effectual way or means of ſuppreſſing or convicting any Schiſm, Sect or Hereſie, or reducing them either to ſubmiſſion of judgement or ſilence.* And therefore he deſires *the prudent to conſider; whether the Authority of the Church of* England *is not much debilitated and brought into contempt, and daily like to wane more and more by this new taken up way of its Defence.* P. 84. P. 98. P. 99.

My Anſwer is, that I have carefully examined and ſearched my Principles and find no ſuch Gunpowder in them for blowing up Authority either of Church or State. For all that I can diſcover, they are very innocent and harmleſs; and if all other mens had been ſo, we had never heard ſo much talk of this way, of undermining and blowing up. But is it not a pleaſant thing to ſee, all of a ſudden, what zeal theſe men diſcover for the preſervation of our Churches Authority? Alas good men! It grieves them at the very heart, to ſee the Authority of our Church weakned and that by its own members. What would not they do for the ſtrengthening and upholding of it? What pity it is, ſuch a Church

ſhould not ſtand, whoſe very enemies take ſuch care for its preſervation; And are ſo ready to diſcover the plots of its own children againſt it? But to be ſure, there is miſchief intended when enemies diſcover it; not by thoſe whom they accuſe, but by the honeſt Informers; who would be content to hold their peace, if they thought they could not ſow miſchief by pretending to diſcover it. It is a pretty plot to make thoſe who deſign to defend our Church to be the underminers of it, and the moſt profeſſed Enemies its ſureſt Friends. But ſuch plots are too fine to hold, and too thin not to be ſeen through. How is it I beſeech *N. O. that my principles undermine all Church Authority?* Have I any where made the Church a meer ſhadow, and an inſignificant Cypher, a Society depending only on the pleaſure of men for its ſubſiſtence and Authority? This had been indeed to the purpoſe, but not the leaſt word tending that way can be drawn out of any Principles of mine. For I verily believe that the Church is a Society inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf, and inveſted with Authority neceſſary for its Government and preſervation. *But though I cannot deny ſuch an Authority I may render it wholly uſeleſs.* I cannot conceive any ſuch malignant influence in any Principle of mine, but if there be, it muſt be from one of theſe

things.

things. 1. Either becauſe I deny Infallibility in the Guides of the Church. Or 2. Becauſe I ſay that the Scriptures are plain in things neceſſary to ſalvation. Or 3. Becauſe I deny the Authority of the Church of Rome. Or 4. Becauſe I am not for ſuch an effectual way of ſuppreſſing Sects and Hereſies as is in uſe in the Roman Church. But I hope to make it appear that none of theſe do in the leaſt tend to weaken, or bring into contempt the Church of *Englands* authority, nor the juſt Authority of any Church in the World.

1. *Not the denial of Infallibility.* This *N. O.* ſeems to ſuppoſe to be the very *Faux* in the *Gunpowder Plot*, the inſtrument of ſetting all on Fire. But is there any thing peculiar to my Principles herein? Have not all who have written againſt the Church of Rome oppoſed the pretence of Infallibility? how then come my principles to be of ſo miſchievous a nature above others? But I pray, Sir, are Authority and Infallibility all one in your account? We ſuppoſe that Magiſtrates and Parents, and Maſters have all of them an unqueſtionable Authority but I never heard yet of any man that ſaid they were infallible: or that there was no ground to obey them, if they were not. Why may we not then allow any Authority belonging to the Governours of the Church, and yet think it poſſible for them

to

to be deceived? Is this a ſufficient reaſon for any man to caſt off his ſubjection to his Prince, becauſe it's poſſible he may require ſomething unlawful? or to diſobey his Parents, becauſe they do not ſit in an infallible chair? or to ſlight his Maſter, becauſe he is not Pope? Theſe are ſtrange ways of arguing about matters of Religion, which are ridiculous in any other caſe. If the poſſibility of being deceived deſtroys no other Authority in the world, why ſhould it do that of the Church? The Magiſtrate does not loſe his Authority though we ſay we are to obey God rather than men, and conſequently to examine whether the Laws of men are not repugnant to the Laws of God, which implys that he may require what it is our duty not to do. The Authority of Parents is not deſtroyed, becauſe in ſome caſes we are bound to diſobey them, when they command men to deſtroy or riſe up in arms againſt their Soveraign. How comes it then to paſs, that all Church-Authority is immediately gone, if we do but ſuppoſe a poſſibility of errour in thoſe which have it? But it may be ſaid *it is their office to be Guides, and if we do not follow them abſolutely, we renounce them from being our Guides.* To which I anſwer, there are two ſorts of perſons that ſtand in need of Guides, the blind and the Ignorant; the blind muſt follow their Guides becauſe

cauſe of an incapacity of ſeeing their way, the Ignorant for want of Inſtruction. Yet neither of theſe are bound to believe their Guides Infallible, and to follow them at all adventures. For even the blind by their own ſad experience of frequent falling into ditches or knocking their heads againſt Poſts may have reaſon to queſtion, if not the skill, yet the ſincerity of their Guides, and though they muſt have ſome, may ſeek new ones. The ignorant follow their Guides only upon the opinion of their skill and integrity; and when they ſee reaſon to Queſtion theſe, they know of no obligation to follow their conduct over rocks and precipices; if they are ſo careleſs of their own welfare, others are not bound to follow them therein. But we are not to preſume perſons ſo wholly Ignorant, but they have ſome general Rules by which to Judge of the skill and fidelity of their Guides. If a Perſon commits himſelf to the care of a Pilot to carry him to *Conſtantinople* becauſe of his ignorance of the Sea, ſhould this man ſtill reſy upon his Authority, if he carried him to find out the North Weſt paſſage? No: though he may not know the particular Coaſts ſo well; yet he knows the Eaſt and Weſt, the North and South from each other. If a ſtranger ſhould take a Guide to conduct him from *London* to *York*, although he may not think

think fit to diſpute with him at every doubtful turning, yet is he bound to follow him when he travels all day with the Sun in his face? for although he doth not know the direct road, yet he knows that he is to go Northward. The meaning of all this is, that the ſuppoſition of Guides in Religion doth depend upon ſome common principles of Religion that are or may be known to all, and ſome precepts ſo plain that every Chriſtian without any help may know them to be his duty; within the compaſs of theſe plain and known duties, lyes the capacity of perſons judging of their Guides; if they carry them out of this beaten way, they have no reaſon to rely upon them in other things: if they keep themſelves carefully within thoſe bounds, and ſhew great integrity therein, then in doubtful and obſcure things they may with more ſafety rely upon them. But if they tell them they muſt put out their eyes to follow them the better, or if they kindly allow them to keep their eyes in their heads, yet they muſt believe them againſt their eye-ſight, if they perſwade them to break plain Commands of God and to alter the Inſtitutions of Chriſt, what reaſon can there be that any ſhould commit themſelves to the abſolute Conduct of ſuch unfaithful Guides? And this is not to deſtroy all Authority of faithful Guides, for they may be

of

of great uſe for the direction of unskilful perſons in matters that are doubtful and require skill to reſolve them, but it is only to ſuppoſe that their Authority is not abſolute nor their direction infallible. *But if we take away this Infallible direction from the Guides of the Church, what Authority is there left them?* As much as ever God gave them, and if they will not be contented with that, we cannot help it; and that it may appear how vain and frivolous theſe exceptions are, I ſhall now ſhew what real Authority is ſtill left in the Governours of the Church, though Infallibility be taken away. And that lyes in three things.

1. An Authority of inflicting cenſures upon offenders; which is commonly called the Power of the keys, or of receiving into and excluding out of the Communion of the Church. This the Church was inveſted with by Chriſt himſelf, and is the neceſſary conſequence of the being and inſtitution of a Chriſtian Society, which cannot be preſerved in its purity and peace without it. Which Authority belongs to the Governours of the Church, and however the Church in ſome reſpects be incorporated with the Commonwealth in a Chriſtian State, yet its Fundamental Rights remain diſtinct from it: of which this is one of the chief to receive into and exclude

exclude out of the Church ſuch perſons which, according to the Laws of a Chriſtian Society, are fit to be taken in or ſhut out.

2. An Authority of making Rules and Canons about matters of order and decency in the Church. Not meerly in the neceſſary circumſtances of time and place, and ſuch things the contrary to which imply a natural indecency; but in continuing and eſtabliſhing thoſe ancient rites of the Chriſtian Church, which were practiſed in the early times of Chriſtianity, and are in themſelves of an indifferent nature. Which Authority of the Church hath been not only aſſerted in the Articles of our Church, but
Art. 20. ſtrenuouſly defended againſt the trifling objections of her Enemies, from Scripture, Antiquity and Reaſon. And I freely grant, not only that ſuch an Authority is in it ſelf reaſonable and juſt; but that in ſuch matters required by a Lawful Authority (ſuch as that of our Church is) there is an advantage on the ſide of Authority, againſt a ſcrupulous Conſcience, which ought to over-rule the practice of ſuch who are the members of that Church.

3. An Authority of propoſing matters of *faith* and directing men in Religion. Which is the proper Authority of Teachers, and Guides, and Inſtructers of others; which may be done ſeveral ways, as by particular in-

inſtruction of doubtful perſons, who are bound to make uſe of the beſt helps they can, among which that of their Guides is the moſt ready and uſeful, and who are obliged to take care of their Souls, and therefore to give the moſt faithful advice and Counſel to them. Beſides this, there is a publick way of inſtructing by diſcourſes grounded upon Scripture to particular congregations, aſſembled together for the worſhip of God in places ſet apart for that end and therefore called Churches. And thoſe who are duly appointed for this work, and ordained by thoſe whoſe office is to ordain, *viz.* the Biſhops, have an Authority to declare what the mind and Will of God is, contained in Scripture in order to the Salvation and edification of the Souls of men. But beſides this, we may conſider the Biſhops and repreſentative Clergy of a Church as met together for reforming any abuſes crept into the practice of Religion or errours in Doctrine; and in this caſe we aſſert that ſuch a Synod or Convocation hath the power and Authority within it ſelf (eſpecially having all the ancient rights of a Patriarchal Church) when a more general conſent cannot be obtained to publiſh and declare what thoſe errours & abuſes are, & to do as much as in them lyes to reform them, *viz.* by requiring a conſent to ſuch propoſitions as

are

are agreed upon for that end, of those who are to enjoy the publick offices of teaching and instructing others. Not to the end that all those propositions should be believed as Articles of Faith; but because no Reformation can be effected, if persons may be allowed to preach and officiate in the Church in a way contrary to the design of such a Reformation.

And this is now that Authority we attribute to the Governours of our Church, although we allow no Infallibility to them. And herein we proceed in a due mean between the extremes of robbing the Church of all Authority of one side; and advancing it to Infallibility on the other. But we cannot help the weakness of those mens understanding, who cannot apprehend that any such thing as Authority should be left in a Church, if we deny Infallibility. Other diseases may be cured, but natural incapacity cannot.

2. *Not, the making Scriptures plain to all sober enquirers in matters necessary to Salvation.* This is that principle which N. O. makes such horrible out-crys about, as though it were the Foundation of all the heresies and Sects in the World. *This*, he saith, *makes all Ecclesiastical Authority useless; for what need is there of Bishops, Presbyters, or any Ec-*

Eccleſiaſtical Paſtors among Proteſtants, as to the office of teaching or expounding theſe writings, if theſe in all neceſſaries are clear to all perſons, who deſire to know the meaning of them: But not content with this modeſt charge in compariſon, in another Treatiſe; he makes this the very heighth of Fanaticiſm, in ſpight of Mother *Juliana* and their Legendary Saints: *becauſe*, forſooth, *this is to ground all our Religion upon our own fancies, enquiring into the true ſenſe of* divine *Revelation*; and therefore, good man, ſeems troubled at it, *that he can by no means in the world abſolve me from being not only a Fanatick, but a Teacher of Fanaticiſm.* In earneſt, it was happily found out, to return this heavy charge back upon my ſelf with ſo much rage and violence; (for although *N. O.* be a modeſt man, yet *S. C.* is a meer fury) for not meerly *Fanaticiſm, pure putid Fanaticiſm follows from this principle, Fanaticiſm without vizard or diſguiſe*, and *all this demonſtratively proved from this Principle, But all our Church is immediately gone with it*; Men may talk of dangerous plots for undermining and blowing up of Towns and Forts and Parliaments, but what are all thoſe to the blowing up a whole Church at once? For ſince that Train of my Principles hath been laid, nothing like the old Church

P. 15.

Fanaticiſm Fanatically imputed to the Roman Church. p. 93.

P. 95.

P. 92.

P. 89.

of *England* hath been ſeen. It is true, there are the ſame Biſhops, the ſame Authority, the ſame Liturgy and Ceremonies, the ſame Preachers and Officers that were; but what are all theſe to the Church of *England?*

P. 99. For *from hence it follows* (if we believe *S. C.*) *that the Governours of our Church have no Authority to teach truth, or to condemn errours; and all the people are become Prophets, and all their Articles, Conſtitutions and Ordinances have been compoſed and enjoyned by an uſurped Authority.* Very ſad conſequences truly! but like deep plots they lye very far out of ſight. For to my underſtanding, not one of theſe diſmal things follows any more from my Principles, than from proving that *S. C.* and *N. O.* both ſtand for the ſame Perſon. Which will eaſily appear to any one elſe that will but conſider. 1. The intention of thoſe Principles. 2. The juſt conſequence of them.

1. The intention of thoſe Principles; which was plainly to lay down the Foundations of a Chriſtians faith living in the Communion of our Church; (which is expreſſed in as perſpicuous terms before them as may be;) and to ſhew that the Roman Churches Infallibility is no neceſſary Foundation of Faith. Now, this being the deſign of thoſe Principles, to what purpoſe ſhould I have

gone

gone about therein, to have ſtated the nature and bounds of the Authority of particular Churches. I no where in the leaſt exclude the uſe of all means and due helps of Guides and others for the underſtanding the ſenſe of Scripture; and I no where mention them; becauſe my buſineſs was only about the Foundation of Faith, and whether Infallibility was neceſſary for that or no? If I have proved it was not, I have gained my deſign; for then thoſe who deny the Church of Romes Infallibility may never the leſs have a ſure Foundation, or ſolid Principles to build their Faith upon. Now to what purpoſe in an account of the Principles of Faith ſhould I mention thoſe things, which we do not build our faith upon, I mean the Authority of our Guides; for although we allow them all the uſefulneſs of helps; yet thoſe are no more to be mentioned in the Principles of reſolving Faith, than *Eulids* Maſter was to be mentioned in his Demonſtrations. For although he might learn his skill from him; yet the force of his Demonſtrations did not depend upon his Authority. I hope it now appears, how far I am from making *Church-Authority uſeleſs*; but I ſtill ſay our Faith is not to be reſolved into it, and therefore is not to be reckoned as a Principle or Foundation of Faith. To that end it is ſufficient to prove,

that men in the due use of means, whom I call *sober enquirers*, may without any Infallible Church, believe the Scriptures, and understand what is necessary to their Salvation herein: If this may be, then I say it follows (*Princ.* 15.) that there can be no necessity supposed of any infallible Society of men, either to attest or explain these Writings, among Christians. Not one word that takes away the use of Authority in the Church, but only of Infallibility; *but it may be said that although it might not be my intention, yet it may be the just consequence of the Principles themselves*

2. Therefore I shall now prove that no consequence drawn from them can infer this. For what if all those things which are necessary to Salvation are plain in Scripture, to all that sincerely endeavour to understand them, doth it hence follow that there can be no just Authority in a Church, no use of Persons to instruct others, must all the people become Prophets and no bounds be set to the liberty of Prophesying? These are bad consequences; but the comfort is, they are not true. If I should say that the necessary Rules for a mans health are so plainly laid down by *Hippocrates*, that every one that will take the pains may understand them; doth this make the whole profession of Physick useless, or license every

every man to practiſe Phyſick that will, or make it needleſs to have any Profeſſours in that faculty? When the Philoſophers of old did ſo frequently inculcate that the neceſſaries for life were few and eaſie; did this make all Political Government uſeleſs, and give every man power to do what he pleaſed? Men of any common underſtanding would diſtinguiſh between the neceſſaries of life and civil Society; ſo would any one but *S. C.* or *N. O.* of the neceſſaries to Salvation, and to the Government of the Church; For men muſt be conſidered firſt as Chriſtians, and then as Chriſtians united together: as in civil Societies they are to be conſidered firſt as men, and then as *Cives*; to ſay, that a man hath all that is neceſſary to preſerve his life as a man, doth not overthrow the Conſtitution of a Society, although it implys that he might live without it: ſo when men are conſidered barely as Chriſtians no more ought to be thought neceſſary for them as ſuch, but what makes them capable of Salvation; but if we conſider them as joyning together in a Chriſtian Society, then many other things are neceſſary for that end: For then there muſt be Authority in ſome and ſubjection in others, there muſt be orders and Conſtitutions, whereby all muſt be kept within their due bounds, and there muſt be perſons appointed to in-

ſtruct the Ignorant, to ſatisfy the doubting, to direct the unskilful, and to help the weak. It belongs to ſuch a Society not barely to provide for neceſſity but ſafety, and not meerly the ſafety of particular perſons but of it ſelf; which cannot be done without prudent orders, fixing the bounds of mens imployments, and not ſuffering every pretender to viſions and Revelations to ſet up for a new Sect, or which is all one a new Order of Religious men. How comes it now to paſs that by ſaying that men, conſidered barely as Chriſtians, may underſtand all that is neceſſary to their Salvation, *I do overthrow all Authority of a Church and make all men Prophets?* Do I in the leaſt mention mens teaching others, or being able themſelves to put a difference, between what is ſo neceſſary and what not; or doth *S. C.* ſuppoſe that all that underſtand what is neceſſary to Salvation have no need to be ruled and governed? If he thinks ſo, I aſſure him I am quite of another opinion, and do make no queſtion but that Government ought to be preſerved in a Church, though the neceſſaries to Salvation be known to all in it; and ſo I ſuppoſe doth any one elſe that in the leaſt conſiders what he ſays. By this we ſee, that *S. C*'s. recrimination of *Fanaticiſm* on our Church, by vertue of this principle is as feeble as the Defence

rence he hath made for his own, of which he may hear in due time. But if there be any *Fanaticism* in this principle, we have the concurrence of the greatest and wisest persons of the Christian Church in it: Two of them especially have in terms said as much as I have done, St. *Augustin* in his Books of Christian Doctrine already mentioned: and St. *Chrysostome* in as plain words as may be. Πάντα σαφῆ καὶ εὐθέα τὰ παρὰ ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς. Πάντα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα. *All things are plain and right in the holy Scriptures; all necessary things are manifest.* Let *S. C.* now charge all the dreadful consequences of this principle on St. *Chrysostome*, and tell him that he destroyed all Church-Authority, and laid the Foundation for the height of *Fanaticism?* Nay S. *Chrysostome* goes much higher than I do, for he saith τίς γὰρ χρεία ὁμιλητοῦ; ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας ῥαθυμίας αὕτη ἡ χρεία γέγονε. Διὰ τί γὰρ ὁμιλίας χρεία; πάντα σαφῆ, &c. If I had made the Guides of the Church so useless as St. *Chrysostome* seems to do in these words what passionate and hideous out-crys would, *S. C.* have made? And by this let the skill or ingenuity of *S. C.* be tryed, who says, *that I cannot find out one single short sentence in Antiquity to support the main pillar of my Religion*, which he supposes this principle to be; and for the finding out the sense of Scripture without the help of Infallibility,

Chrysost. in 2. ad Thess. Hom. 3.

S. C. p. 117.

I have produced more out of Antiquity in this diſcourſe, than either he or his whole partie will be able to Anſwer.

3. Not *the denying the Authority of the Church of Rome.* Which I muſt do till I ſee ſome better proofs for it, than I have ever yet done. But how doth this, *deſtroy all Authority in a Church?* can there be none, but what is derived from *Rome?* I do not think, I do in the leaſt diminiſh the Kings Authority, by denying that he derives it from the *Cham* of *Tartary*, or the *Great Mogol*: although they may challenge the Lordſhip of the whole Earth to themſelves: and may pretend very plauſible reaſons that it would be much more for the quiet and conveniency of mankind to be all under one univerſal Monarch, and that none have ſo fair a pretence to it, as they that have challenged the Right of it to themſelves: and yet for all this, I do verily believe the King hath an unqueſtionable right to his Kingdom, and a juſt Authority over all his ſubjects. The time was when the firſt of *Geneſis* would ſerve to prove the Popes title, and *the Suns ruling by day* was thought a clear argument for his ſupremacy; but the world is now altered and all the wit and ſubtility that hath been ſince uſed hath not been able to make good

good that crackt title of Universal Pastorship, which the Bishops of *Rome* have taken to themselves. But although we disown the Popes Authority as an unjust usurpation, we assert and plead for the Authority of the Church and the Bishops who are placed therein, who derive their power to Govern the Church from Christ and not from the Pope. And I dare appeal to any Person, whether the asserting the Bishops deriving their Authority from Christ or from the Pope, be the better way of defending their Power? We are not now disputing what Authority were fit to be entrusted in the Popes hands, supposing all other differences composed, and that things were in the same State wherein they were in the times of the 4. General Councils; in which case, it ought to be considered, how far it might be convenient to give way to such an Authority so apt to grow extravagant, and which hath been stretched so very far beyond what the Canons allowed, that it hath challenged Infallibility to it self; but the thing at present under debate, is, whether the disallowing the *Papal Hierarchy* doth overthrow all Authority in the Episcopal; which is in effect to ask, whether there be any other power besides the Popes in the Church? for if there be any other, the denying the Popes Authority over us cannot

in

in the leaſt diminiſh the juſt Authority of Biſhops.

The only conſiderable Queſtion in this caſe, is, whether the rejecting that *Hierarchy* which was in being at the the time of the Reformation, doth not make way for the peoples rejecting the Authority of our Biſhops, and conſequently no Authority in the Church can be maintained, unleſs we again yield to the *Papal* Authority. This I ſuppoſe to be *N. O.* meaning, when he tells us *by Church-Authority* he means *that Superior and more comprehenſive Body of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy; which in any diſſent and diviſion of the Clergy, according to the Church Canons ought to be obeyed. And any particular Church divided from this more univerſal cannot with the leaſt pretence of reaſon challenge ſubmiſſion from her ſubjects, ſince ſhe her ſelf (and particularly the Church of* England) *refuſed the ſame to all the Authority extant in the world, when ſhe ſeparated her ſelf.* To this I anſwer,

Præface to Principles conſidered.

That the Church of *England* in Reforming her ſelf did not oppoſe any juſt Authority then extant in the World. It is to no purpoſe to make ſuch loud clamours about our Churches refuſing ſubmiſſion to all the Authority then extant in the World, unleſs there be better Evidence produced for it, than we have yet ſeen. For it is very well known

that

that the diſpute was then concerning the Popes Supremacy over our Church, which we have all along aſſerted to have been a notorious encroachment upon the liberties of our Church. And the Popes uſurpations were ſo injurious both to the Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Government, that thoſe who adhered to the Religion of the Roman Church yet agreed to the rejecting that Authority which he challenged in *England*. Which is ſufficiently known to have been the beginning of the Breach, between the two Churches. Afterwards, when it was thus agreed that the Biſhop of *Rome* had no ſuch Authority as he challenged, what ſhould hinder our Church from proceeding in the beſt way it could for the Reformation of it ſelf? For the Popes Supremacy being caſt out as an uſurpation, our Church was thereby declared to be a *Free Church*, having the Power of Government within it ſelf. And, what method of proceeding could be more reaſonable in this caſe, than by the advice of the Governours of the Church and by the concurrence of civil Authority, to publiſh ſuch Rules and Articles, according to which Religion was to be profeſſed and the worſhip of God ſetled in *England*? And this is that which *N. O.* calls *refuſing ſubmiſſion to all the Authority then extant in the world*; was *all the Authority then extant*,

extant; ſhut up in the Popes Breaſt? was there no due power of Governing left, becauſe his unjuſt power was caſt off, and that firſt by Biſhops, who in other things adhered to the Roman Church? *But they proceeded farther and altered many things in Religion againſt the Conſent of the more Univerſal Church*: It is plain ſince our Church was declared to be *Free* they had a Liberty of enquiring and determining things fitteſt to be believed and practiſed; this then could not be her fault. *But in thoſe things they decreed, they went contrary to the conſent of the Univerſal Church:* Here we are now come to the merits of the cauſe; and we have from the beginning of the Reformation defended, that we rejected nothing but innovations, and Reformed nothing but Abuſes. *But the Church thought otherwiſe of them.* What Church I pray? The Primitive and Apoſtolical? that we have always appealed to and offered to be tryed by. The truly Catholick Church of all Ages? That we utterly deny to have agreed in any one thing againſt the Church of *England*. But the plain *Engliſh* of all is, the Church of *Rome* was againſt the Church of *England*; and no wonder, for the Church of *England* was againſt the Church of *Rome*; but we know of no Fault we are guilty of therein; nor any obligation of ſubmiſſion to the

the Commands of that Church. And *N. O.* doth not ſay, that we oppoſed the whole Church, but *the more Univerſal Church, i. e.* I ſuppoſe the greater number of Perſons at that time. But doth he undertake to make this good, that the greater number of Chriſtians, then in the world, did oppoſe the Church of *England?* How doth he know that the Eaſtern, Armenian, Abyſſin and Greek Churches did agree with the Church of *Rome* againſt us? No: that is not his meaning; but by *the more Univerſal Church*, he fairly underſtands no more but the Church of *Rome.* And that we did oppoſe the Doctrine and practices of the Church of *Rome* we deny not; but we utterly deny that to be the *Catholick Church*; or that we oppoſed any lawful Authority in denying ſubmiſſion to it. *But according to the Canons of the Church we are to obey, in any diſſent or diviſion of the Clergy, the Superior and more comprehenſive Body of the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy.* What he means by this, I do not well underſtand, either it muſt be the Authority of the Pope and Councils of the Roman Church, or a General Council of all the Catholick Church. For the firſt, we owe no obedience to them, for the ſecond, there was no ſuch thing then in the world, and therefore could not be oppoſed. And *for the Canons of the Catholick*

Com-

Councils before the breaches of Christendom, no Church hath been more guilty of a violation of them, than the Church of *Rome*, since *the Rules of the Fathers* have been turned into *the Royalties of S.* Peter. We are no Enemies to the ancient Patriarchal Government of the Christian Church, and are far more for preserving the Dignity of it, than the Roman Church can be: For we should think it a happy State of the Christian Church, if all the Patriarchs did enjoy their ancient power and priviledges, and all Christendom would consent to a truly Free and General Council; which we look on as the best expedient on earth, for composing the differences of the Christian World, if it might be had. But we cannot endure to be abused by meer names of titular Patriarchs, but real Servants and Pensionaries of the Popes, with combinations of interested parties instead of General Councils, with the pleasure of Popes instead of ancient Canons. Let them reduce the ancient Government of the Church within its due bounds; let the Bishop of *Rome* content himself with the priviledges he then enjoyed; let debates be free and Bishops assemble with an equal proportion out of all Churches of Christendom; and if we then oppose so general a consent of the Christian Church, let them charge us *with not submitting*

willing to all the Authority extant of the world. But ſince, the State of Chriſtendom hath been ſo much divided, that a truly General Council is next to an impoſſible thing, the Church muſt be Reformed by its parts, and every *Free Church*, enjoying the Rights of a Patriarchal See, hath according to the Canons of the Church a ſufficient power to Reform all abuſes within it ſelf, when a more general conſent cannot be obtained. By this we may ſee how very feeble this charge is *of deſtroying all Church-Authority* by *refuſing ſubmiſſion to the Roman Hierarchy:* and how very pityful an advantage can from hence be made by the diſſenting parties among us, who decry that Patriarchal and ancient Government as Anti-chriſtian which we allow as Prudent and Chriſtian. But of the difference of theſe two caſes, I have ſpoken already.

4. But yet *N. O.* ſaith, *my principles afford no effectual way or means in this Church of ſuppreſſing or convicting any Schiſm, Sect or Hereſie, or reducing them either to ſubmiſſion of judgement or ſilence:* Therefore my Principles are deſtructive to all Church-Authority. To which I anſwer, P. 98.

1. That the deſign of my Principles was to lay down the Foundations of Faith, and not

not *the means of ſuppreſſing hereſies.* If I had laid down the Foundations of Peace and left all Perſons to their own judgements without any regard to Authority, this might have been juſtly objected againſt me; but according to this way, it might have been objected to *Ariſtotle* that he was an Enemy to civil Government, becauſe he doth not lay down the Rules of it in his *Logick*, or that *Hippocrates* favoured the *Chymiſts* and *Mountebanks*, becauſe he ſaith not a word of the *Colledge of Phyſitians.* If I had ſaid any thing about the Authority of particular Churches, or the ways of ſuppreſſing Sects; then how inſultingly had I been asked; What is all this to the Foundations of Faith? Excellent Proteſtant principles of Faith! They begin now to reſolve faith into the Authority of their own Church: or elſe to what end is this mentioned, where nothing is pretended to but laying down the Foundations on which Proteſtants do build their faith? But although there be no way of eſcaping impertinent objections, yet it is ſome ſatisfaction to ones ſelf to have given no occaſion for them.

2. I would know what he underſtands by his *effectual means of ſuppreſſing Sects or Hereſies.* We are ſure the meer Authority of their Church hath been no more *effectual means*,

means, than that of ours hath been; but there is another means they uſe which is far more *effectual* viz. the *Inquiſition*. This in truth is all the *effectual means* they have above us; but God keep us from ſo Barbarous and Diabolical a means of ſuppreſſing Schiſms; The *Sanbenits* have not more pictures of Devils upon them, than the Inquiſition it ſelf hath of their Spirit in it; however that Gracious Pope *Paul* 4. attributed the ſettling of it in Spain *to the Inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt*; not that Holy Ghoſt certainly, that came down from Heaven upon the Apoſtles; but that which was conveyed in a Portmantue from *Rome* to the Council of *Trent*. But if this be *the effectual means* he underſtands, I hope he doth not think it any credit to the Authority of their Church, that all who diſpute it muſt endure a moſt miſerable life or a moſt cruel death. All the other means they have are but probable; but this, this is the moſt *effectual*. How admirably do Fire and Faggots end Controverſies! No general Council ſignifies half ſo much as a Court of Inquiſition; and the Pope himſelf is not near ſo good a Judge of Controverſies as the Executioner, and *Dic Eccleſiæ* is nothing to *take him Gaoler*. These have been the kind, the tender, the primitive, the Chriſtian means of ſuppreſſing Sects and Hereſies in

Jacob Simanca Enchir. judic. viol. Relig. Tit. 68. n. 18.

the Roman Church! O how compaſſionate a Mother is that Church, that takes her froward Children in her hands to daſh their brains againſt the ſtones! *O how pleaſant a thing it is for Brethren* to be deſtroyed for lack of *Unity! How beautiful upon the 7. Mountains are the Feet of thoſe who ſhed the Blood of Hereticks!* Never were there two men had a more Catholick Spirit, than *Dioclesian* and *Biſhop Bonner.* Men may talk to the worlds end of Councils and Fathers and Authority of the Church and I know not what inſignificant nothings; come, come, there is but one *effectual means*, which the good *Cardinal Baronius* ſuggeſted to his Holineſs, *Ariſe Peter, kill and eat.* Let the Hereticks talk of the kind and merciful Spirit of our Saviour who rebuked his Diſciples ſo ſharply for calling *for fire from Heaven upon the Samaritans*, and told them *they did not know what Spirit they are of*: let them diſpute never ſo much againſt the cruelty and unreaſonableneſs of ſuch a way of confuting them; let them muſter up never ſo many ſayings of Fathers againſt it; yet when all is done, what ever becomes of Chriſtianity, it was truly ſaid of *Paul 4. that the Authority of the Roman See depends only upon the office of the Inquiſition.* And that we may think, he was in good earneſt when he ſaid it,

Luke 9.55.

Onn-

Onuphrius tells us it was part of the ſpeech he made to the Cardinals before his death. Was not this think we, a true Vicar of Chriſt? a man of an Apoſtolical Spirit? that knew the moſt *effectual means* of ſuppreſſing hereſies and Schiſms and advancing the Authority of the Roman See. And that we may not think their opinion is altered in this matter, one of the late Conſulters of the Inquiſition hath determined that the practice of the Roman Church in the office of the Inquiſition is *reaſonable*, *pious*, *uſeful*, *and neceſſary*; Which he proves by the Teſtimony of their greateſt Doctors. And by which we may eaſily judge what N. O. and his Brethren think to be the moſt *effectual means of ſuppreſſing Sects and Hereſies*, with the want of which we are contented to be upbraided. But ſetting this aſide we have as many reaſonable means, and I think many more of convicting diſſenters, than they can pretend to, in the Roman Church.

Onuphr. vit. Pauli 4.

Del. bene de offic. Inquiſit. part. 1. dub. 162. Petit. 5. 8.

3. It is very well known that we do endeavour, as much as lyes in us, to reclaim all Diſſenters; but God never wrought Miracles to cure incorrigible perſons, and would not have us to go out of the way of our duty to ſuppreſs Sects and Hereſies. The greateſt ſeverities have not effected it, (which made one of the Inquiſitors in *Italy* complain that

Ger. Buſdragi Epiſtol. ad Cardinal. Piſan.

after 40. years experience, wherein they had deſtroyed above 100000. Perſons for hereſie, (as they call it) it was ſo far from being ſuppreſſed or weakned that it was extremly ſtrengthened and increaſed. What wonder is it then, if diſſenters ſhould yet continue among us, who do not uſe ſuch Barbarous ways of ſtopping the mouths of Hereticks with burning lead, or ſilencing them by a rope and flames. But we recommend as much as they can do to the people the vertues of *Humility*, *Obedience*, *due ſubmiſſion to their Spiritual Paſtors and Governours*, *and that they ought not to uſurp their office, and become their own Guides:* which *N. O.* in his concluſion blames us for not doing. Yet we do not exact of them a blind obedience, we allow them to underſtand the nature and Doctrine of Chriſtianity, which the more they do, we are ſure they will be ſo much the better Chriſtians and the more eaſily Governed. So that we have no kind of Controverſie about Church-Authority it ſelf but what it is, and in what manner, and by whom to be exerciſed; but ſurely *N. O.* had little to ſay, when from laying down the Principles of Faith, he charges me with this moſt abſurd conſequence of deſtroying all Church-Authority.

I have thus far conſidered the main Foun-

Foundations upon which *N. O.* proceeds in oppoſition to my Principles, there is now very little remaining which deſerves any Notice: and that which ſeems to do it as about Negative Articles of Faith, and the marks of the True Church I ſhall have occaſion to handle them at large in the following diſcourſe.

F I N I S.